United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.16

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

16th Meeting
Wednesday, 9 November 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Agenda items 53-66, 68-72 and 153 *(continued)*

Consideration of draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first speaker this afternoon is the representative of Germany, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): It is my privilege today to introduce, on behalf of 37 sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures". This draft resolution represents a traditional subject of the First Committee, which has been pursued by Germany and by many of the other sponsors for many years.

In 1988, the Disarmament Commission adopted a set of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level. Since then, the General Assembly has several times endorsed those guidelines and has encouraged Member States to implement them. Successive past resolutions on this issue were modified in order to reflect recent political developments, taking into account the accumulation of relevant experience in this field.

In 1988, some delegations requested that criteria and characteristics of a regional approach to confidence-building measures should be spelled out in greater detail. This task has now been carried out in the context of the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1993. Therefore, it is fair to state that the international community now possesses a whole set of guidelines and recommendations on confidence-building measures, very recently reviewed and endorsed by the international community itself.

Today, confidence-building measures are widely accepted as a useful means in the context of maintaining and enhancing international and regional peace and security. Twenty years ago, confidence-building measures were implemented mostly to ease political and military tensions and thus to contribute to a better relationship between States and between groups of States. Since then, confidence-building measures have become part of arms-control and disarmament agreements, and even of arrangements related to non-security issues. Furthermore, in recent years confidence-building measures have been developed as an instrument to contribute to conflict prevention and to peacemaking and peace-building activities.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 is intended to cover the whole spectrum of the current concept and implementation of confidence-building measures. Taking this into account, paragraph 7 suggests the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the fifty-first session an item entitled "Confidence-building measures" in order to give Member States an opportunity to raise all relevant issues in this context.

The sponsors of this draft resolution are convinced that, in view of the world-wide support for and

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

implementation of confidence-building measures, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 can be adopted without a vote, as has been the case for resolutions on this issue in previous years.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* The next speaker is the representative of Egypt, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11, entitled "The threat of nuclear armament in the Middle East", which is sponsored by the delegations of Indonesia, Jordan, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Egypt.

The draft resolution submitted this year under agenda item 65 constitutes a dramatic departure from the texts of previous years, both in form and in substance. Its sole objective is to strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the regional context of the Middle East. For decades this sensitive region of the world has been the theatre of devastating armed conflicts, which have posed a severe and constant threat to international peace and security. With the advent of the recent positive political developments in the Middle East as a result of the ongoing peace process, it is ever more pressing to safeguard the region from the ominous consequences associated with the introduction of nuclear weapons and the perils of a future nuclear-arms race. The total elimination of this threat would no doubt contribute to consolidating the peace process and increasing its momentum. This objective, as is clear from the draft resolution, cannot be achieved unless all States of the region undertake equal obligations and equal responsibilities, and enjoy equal rights, as stipulated in the NPT. The key is total equality across the board.

I shall turn now to a most important feature of the draft resolution. Let me start by saying that resolutions adopted in past years were considered by many delegations as imbalanced, because they focused on one State. Many considered that they could not support the "singling out" feature in those resolutions. Fortunately, recent positive developments in the Middle East have contributed to creating a climate of confidence and cooperation, and there is no need for any further confrontation.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11 addresses all — I repeat, all — States of the region not parties to the NPT in a precise and factual manner, on the basis of their level of advancement in nuclear technology. I must note that the singling out of one State, which was a feature of previous resolutions, has been eliminated. It has been dropped. Those who are reluctant to extend their support to A/C.1/49/L.11 are, in point of fact, singling out the Middle East as a region. They would be sending a clear message that the international community is willing to acquiesce in nuclear proliferation when it comes to the Middle East, and it is our turn now to say that this singling out cannot be accepted.

The universality of the NPT is considered to be a truly effective means of eliminating the threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is certainly just as applicable at the regional level as it is at the global level. The thrust of the draft resolution is in conformity with the importance the international community attaches to the NPT and its universality and to the necessity to further strengthen its effectiveness, in particular as we approach the 1995 Conference on the review and extension of the NPT.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11 is a non-proliferation text and nothing else. Those who support the NPT and those who advocate that we should be open-minded when the review Conference takes place next April are in duty bound to support draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11.

The draft resolution is balanced in that it calls, in identical terms, on all non-parties to the NPT in the Middle East to accede to the Treaty and to place all their nuclear facilities under the full- scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. At the same time, the draft resolution is factual in defining the level of the non-parties' advancement in the nuclear field. It reflects today's realities: that one of the non-parties in the region has an advanced unsafeguarded nuclear programme, whereas the others have no such programmes at all.

The continuation of the current imbalance in the commitment of the States of the Middle East to the non-proliferation Treaty would constitute a real threat to the security of the region. The ongoing efforts to achieve a lasting and comprehensive peace deserve a realistic assessment of the security concerns of all the States of the region.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have legitimate expectations. They expect that the international community will apply one single yardstick where the NPT regime is concerned. We expect — and, I submit, we are entitled to receive — even-handed treatment from the international community. We expect unequivocal support for the NPT. It is totally unwarranted and discriminatory to shelter any non-party to the NPT from the need to conform to the general and solid resolve of the international community to ensure universal adherence to the Treaty. Any exception will cast serious doubts on the sincerity of those advocating the extension of the NPT in 1995.

Before concluding, I should like to say that in formulating the text of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11, the sponsors have gone to great lengths to accommodate the various views expressed in the Committee on this important issue. The sponsors are open-minded and are willing to react to any meaningful proposal to make the text more acceptable. It is hoped that the draft resolution will gain wide support, reflecting the importance that Member States attach to the NPT, to its universality and to the necessity to embark on its extension. Our common objective is the total elimination of nuclear armament in the Middle East.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* The next speaker is the representative of Chile, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7.

Mr. Larrain (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I am honoured to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7, on the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, which is sponsored by Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe and Chile, countries which like my own legitimately aspire to becoming members of that body.

The draft resolution has been the subject of intensive consultations among all groups of countries currently members of the Conference on Disarmament and all countries that have applied for membership. As it examines the implementation of its own recommendations and decisions in the framework of its consideration of the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament, the General Assembly has repeatedly expressed its interest in the expansion of the sole multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament. The most recent statement of its views, resolution 48/77 B, urged the Conference to reach a consensus that would result in the expansion of its membership before the start of its 1994 session.

In order to understand the tight deadline and the optimistic nature of that resolution, which was adopted by consensus in the First Committee and in the General Assembly, we need to keep in mind that the 1993 report of the Conference on Disarmament described the progress achieved and drew the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the Special Coordinator for membership, Ambassador O'Sullivan of Australia, thus giving the impression that a solution was imminent.

The 1994 report, whose overall consideration is the subject of a separate draft resolution, once again recognizes the urgent need for expansion. It notes the efforts made by the Friend of the Chair, Ambassador Lampreis of Brazil, and recognizes that it was not possible to advance beyond the situation described in the 1993 report. The Conference on Disarmament agrees to continue studying the issue with a view to arriving at a solution by the beginning of 1995, given the importance and the urgent nature of the issue as well as the need to comply with its own decision to keep its membership under periodic review.

This intention is fully consonant with the wishes expressed by the Assembly in the Final Document of its tenth special session, held from 23 May to 30 June 1978, to the effect:

> "... that the membership of the Committee" — now known as the Conference — "on Disarmament will be reviewed at regular intervals" *(Resolution S-10/2, para. 120).*

It can be no cause for satisfaction that in the 15 years since that date, which have seen two further special sessions devoted to disarmament, and at a time when we are considering convening a fourth special session, the desired enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament has not occurred.

The profound changes on the international scene call for a decision-making process based on broad and representative participation in which the concept of democracy transcends the framework of national priorities in order to give legitimacy to the role of the international political process as a mainstay of the new order which needs to be built in the post-cold-war period. This has been interpreted in a forceful and insightful way by representatives of the many countries wishing to become members of the Conference on Disarmament. It should be noted that the Final Document of 1978, conceived during the cold-war period, recognized the limited membership of the Conference on Disarmament, but provided for different levels of participation by interested States, by non-member States and, indeed, by the public, and envisaged the holding of world conferences on disarmament.

I shall not dwell on the preambular paragraphs, the last of which reflects the aspirations of the candidate countries to participate fully in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. I shall, however, refer to the two operative paragraphs, their content and the way in which they are interrelated.

The first welcomes the recommendations and additional statement of the Special Coordinator for membership designated by the Conference on Disarmament itself. The second urges the Conference on Disarmament to make every effort to ensure that by the beginning of 1995 there is a significant expansion in its composition as recommended by the Special Coordinator.

Allow me to give a brief explanation of the balance reflected in these two operative paragraphs. Although in the past there have been occasions when the General Assembly, the President of the Assembly or the Chairman of the First Committee became somewhat involved in the preparation of agreements on the enlargement of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, the sponsors of this draft resolution hope that the Conference itself will now resolve this critical issue in conformity with its internal rules of procedure.

The Conference on Disarmament has indicated that it has not been possible for it to make more progress than that reflected in paragraphs 11 and 12 of its 1993 report, which includes the report of the Special Coordinator, its annexes and a further statement by the Special Coordinator. It is important to evoke this background since, as the 1994 report acknowledges, it describes the only — insufficient — progress that has been made in the consideration of the issue.

While the Conference on Disarmament should itself resolve the question, this does not mean that the General Assembly itself should abandon the practice of taking a constant interest in the harmonious functioning of all disarmament machinery.

In urging the Conference on Disarmament to resolve the thorny problem of enlargement, we have set a number of minimum parameters: the deadline that the Conference has set itself; the minimum basis established by the previous recommendations of the Special Coordinator; and a dynamic forward-looking objective of coordinating all requests for membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

In that light, I trust that the Committee will recommend this draft resolution to the General Assembly by consensus. We sincerely believe that this is a good and appropriate draft resolution which should meet the concerns of all current and aspiring members of the Conference. If we still do not achieve the desired consensus we shall be ready to continue our consultations to find alternative working that would not diminish the force of the message we wish to send.

Mr. Eliason (Denmark): I just want to take this opportunity to inform the Committee that the Danish Government, which has been an observer in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva since it was established, has now decided to apply for full membership. A few days ago the President of the Conference on Disarmament was approached about this decision. My Government hopes that the Conference on Disarmament, to which we attach considerable importance, can agree upon a significant expansion of its membership in the near future.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): My delegation would like to offer some comments and observations on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, which, I understand, will be introduced later by another delegation.

For more than a quarter of a century the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons has engaged the attention of the international community, as it is one of the most important arms-limitation and disarmament issues. Up to now there has been little progress in this area. There are now indications that nuclear-weapon States may be willing to take this question more seriously.

Negative security assurances are political, legal and moral imperatives. The legitimate right of non-nuclear-weapon States to effective international arrangements for negative security assurances is now universally acknowledged. Moreover, there is no doubt that substantive progress in the crucial areas of negative security assurances and of drafting a comprehensive test-ban treaty can contribute towards the successful outcome of the 1995 Conference to review and extend the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

With regard to the modalities of these negative security assurances, some Member States favour the adoption by the Security Council of a resolution on both negative and positive security assurances. The overwhelming majority of Member States, including my own, favours the conclusion of a multilaterally negotiated international convention on negative and positive security assurances. A Security Council resolution on negative security assurances would serve a useful purpose and constitute a significant step in the right direction, provided that it were crafted in such a way as to create international legal norms by which nuclear-weapon States would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and by which non-nuclear-weapon States would remain non-nuclear, and that it dealt comprehensively and satisfactorily with the concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States.

However, such a Security Council resolution would be only a first step and an interim measure. We should continue our effort to conclude a multilaterally negotiated international convention on negative security assurances.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, *inter alia*, recommends that the Conference on Disarmament should actively continue intensive negotiations with a view to reaching early agreement and concluding effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, taking into account the widespread support for the conclusion of an international convention and giving consideration to any other proposals designed to secure the same objective. It is a draft resolution with an important political purpose that my delegation fully shares, and it rightly focuses on the main issue of this question. My delegation is a sponsor of this draft resolution, and we hope that it will be adopted by the Committee with the overwhelming support of Member States.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Mali, who will introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1.

Mr. Samassekou (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", on behalf of the following sponsors: Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo.

As the members of the Committee will recall, the statements made in this room on the question of small arms — by Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Marrack Goulding, and by the delegation of Mali and other delegations — drew the attention of the international community to the danger that uncontrolled traffic in and accumulation of small arms represents for many countries. The draft resolution comes in this context, and it complements the previous General Assembly resolutions on so-called weapons of mass destruction. Despite their size, small arms are in the end proving more deadly, and they remain a grave threat to populations and a destabilizing factor for States at both the national and the regional levels. For this reason, illicit traffic in these arms is a matter of grave concern for the States of the Sahara-Sahelian subregion, which are making great efforts to curb such traffic. But those countries cannot deal with the situation on their own; they need the support of the international community.

That is the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1. The sponsors have no doubt that it will be supported by all the members of the Committee and that it will be adopted by consensus.

Finally, I would like to say that we have taken note of the suggestions made recently by some delegations in respect of this draft resolution.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): Canada remains a strong supporter of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and notes with satisfaction that more than 70 countries, representing all regions of the world, have sponsored this year's Netherlands text on transparency in armaments.

The Canadian delegation is pleased to make available to delegations in the First Committee a recent publication containing two reports of direct interest on the question of transparency in conventional arms.

The first report, *The Maturing Conventional Arms Transfer and Production System: Implications for Proliferation Control*, is by Keith Crouse of the York University Centre for International and Strategic Studies. It examines efforts to control the proliferation of conventional weapons in the post-cold-war era.

The second report, *United Nations Register of Conventional Arms: Options and Proposals for Enhancement and Further Development*, is by Edward Lawrence of the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Mr. Lawrence was a consultant to the Secretary-General in the preparation of the experts' reports in both 1992 and 1994. This report provides a brief history of the Register of Conventional Arms, a review of its first year of operation and an evaluation of its current status. The report also systematically evaluates various concepts that could enhance the utility of the Register as an instrument of cooperative security.

Both reports are the result of Canada's ongoing commitment to independent research on disarmament issues. The views expressed in these reports are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Government of Canada. Copies of the reports are available to delegations.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17.

Mr. Nasseri (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am introducing draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.17, under agenda item 64 (b), "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". As I submitted the report of the 1994 session very recently, I shall confine myself to highlighting only the main elements of the draft resolution. It is constructed essentially on the basis of last year's resolution, and it reflects in a very general way the report that has just been submitted to the Committee.

The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, has the primary role in substantive negotiations on priority questions of disarmament. The international community therefore considers that the present international climate should give additional impetus to multilateral negotiations with a view to reaching concrete agreements. The Conference on Disarmament commenced negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty at its 1994 session. This is a significant development in the area of disarmament negotiations. It is welcomed in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, and in operative paragraph 3 the Conference on Disarmament is urged to intensify its negotiations to conclude a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

Furthermore, the Conference on Disarmament should receive the necessary administrative, substantive and conference support services to enable it to do what is required for the fulfilment of its objectives. This fact is acknowledged in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, which requests the Secretary-General to continue to ensure the provision of such services.

The current international situation has given the Conference on Disarmament an opportunity to make substantive progress on priority items on its agenda. In this connection, the Conference has before it a number of urgent and important matters for negotiation. These will make heavy demands on its time and resources. It will therefore have to examine the balance of its future work when deciding which items to concentrate on.

At the same time, the Conference on Disarmament continues the ongoing review of its agenda, membership and methods of work. This is encouraged in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. The question of expanding the membership of the Conference has been followed with keen interest, particularly in recent years, by Conference members. Expansion of the membership is now, more than ever before, a priority task in the process of securing effective and improved functioning of the body. The Conference has agreed to continue to address the question of its expansion and to make every effort to reach a solution by the beginning of its 1995 session, taking into account the importance and urgency of the issue. The formulation included in the draft resolution reflects the intention of the Conference to seek an expeditious resolution of this question.

This is, of course, a moderate draft resolution; it is not easy to encapsulate a year's work of the Conference on Disarmament in such a text. I should add that the First Committee has traditionally adopted corresponding draft resolutions by consensus. I shall conduct further consultations on the text, and I hope to be able soon to present a final version, possibly with minor modifications, for adoption by consensus.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.10, Jamaica; A/C.1/49/L.11, Malaysia; A/C.1/49/L.12, Jamaica and the Republic of Moldova; A/C.1/49/L.13, A/C.1/49/L.18, A/C.1/49/L.19 and A/C.1/49/L.21, Albania; A/C.1/49/L.23, Iceland and Albania; A/C.1/49/L.27, the Republic of Moldova; A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1, Benin, Burundi and Cameroon; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, Finland and the Netherlands.

May I request delegations that wish to become sponsors of any draft resolution, to register their names with the Secretariat. Such additional sponsorships will be read into the official records of the Committee at future meetings.

Programme of work

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* As members will recall, at an earlier meeting of the Committee I indicated that an informal list of all draft resolutions on disarmament and international security agenda items, arranged in appropriate clusters, would be distributed to the Committee. Following intensive consultations with the other officers of the Committee, I am now in a position to present to the Committee for its consideration and approval a paper setting out the Chairman's suggested programme, listing those draft resolutions under 11 different clusters.

I should like to state that the officers of the Committee undertook the task of grouping the various draft resolutions on the basis of the adopted thematic approach on disarmament and international security agenda items. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that the officers of the Committee were guided in their task by their desire to facilitate and expedite the work of the Committee with a view to ensuring the most effective and efficient utilization of the time and the conference resources available during this phase of the work of the Committee.

With regard to the programme of work and the timetable for action on draft resolutions, and on the basis of precedent, it is my intention to move, as far as possible, from one cluster to another sequentially, upon the conclusion of action on each cluster. Nevertheless, in following this procedure, we shall of course maintain the desirable degree of flexibility. Whenever I am in a position to give a precise indication of the days on which any particular cluster will be taken up, I shall advise the Committee accordingly.

In this respect, I should like to inform members that, at the request of a number of delegations, the Committee will act upon the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, on nuclear weapons, during the last stage of its work. Thus, the Committee will begin its action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2.

The procedure during the decision-taking stage on each individual cluster will be that delegations will first have the opportunity to introduce any draft resolution not yet introduced, or to make a statement other than an explanation of vote which they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions listed in the cluster.

Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster before a decision is taken will be able to do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations will be able to explain their positions or votes after the decision has been taken, if they wish to do so.

In order to enable the Chairman to conduct the proceedings of the Committee in a systematic and efficient manner, I should like to urge delegations, in so far as possible, to make one statement on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, whether in the course of a statement or in the explanation of position or vote.

May I take it that the Committee accepts the paper prepared by the officers of the Committee, as contained in the Chairman's suggested programme, and that it is in agreement with the programme of work and the procedure I have just outlined?

It was so decided.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* The Committee will thus proceed to the stage of taking action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items beginning with cluster 2.

I now wish to turn to another related matter. After due consideration, the Bureau was of the opinion that, in order to allow more time for consultations and to permit delegations obtain the requisite instructions from their respective capitals, the Committee should proceed to the action stage not on Friday, 11 November, but rather on Monday, 14 November. This may be all the more necessary in view of the fact that we have extended the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on a number of occasions.

Accordingly, with the concurrence of the Committee, I shall begin the action phase on Monday, 14 November.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

United Nations
A/C.1/49/PV.17

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

17th Meeting
Thursday, 10 November 1994, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Agenda item 73

Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee (A/49/579)

Exchange of views

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I should like to recall that the Committee has made tremendous efforts with regard to the agenda item now before us. The work undertaken by Ambassador von Wagner — Chairman of the Committee at its forty-eighth session — which culminated in the adoption of decision 48/499 was a valuable contribution in this respect. Secondly, resolution 48/87 has been the basic guideline for the Committee in considering this item and pursuing its work, since it established the ten broad topic areas and at the same time instructed the Chairman of the First Committee on how to conduct the consultations on the subsequent rationalization of the work of the Committee with a view to improving its effectiveness.

On the basis of these efforts and in accordance with the aforementioned decision and resolution, in the course of its consideration at this session of the items relating to disarmament and international security, the Committee embarked on an exercise with three basic phases: firstly, a general debate; secondly, structured discussions in informal meetings on specific topics in the thematic approach to the items on disarmament and international security; and, lastly, the adoption of decisions on all the draft resolutions relating to the above-mentioned items.

The view of many delegations, as far as I can tell, indicates that the second phase — based on the experience we have acquired — should be designed to make it easier for delegations to prepare their draft resolutions because the general debate should be aimed at determining the delegations' positions and at assisting them to gauge where the common ground and the difficulties lie in respect of the main questions on the Committee's agenda.

Delegations are now called on to give their assessments of the results of this first attempt. The basic aim is to ensure that the Committee performs its important functions in the most effective manner possible because the items on its agenda unquestionably have implications for fundamental aspects of the maintenance of international peace and security. In pursuit of this aim, the Committee must endeavour to make efficient use of the time and the resources available to it, namely, the conference services. I have no doubt that using conference services efficiently will ensure that the Committee performs more effectively.

Members of the Committee have before them the following documents for the consideration of this item: A/C.1/48/L.59, A/48/688/Add.1, and A/49/579. In addition, I should point out that those delegations represented on the Bureau are studying the possibility of, at a later stage, presenting a draft resolution on this issue.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): The question of rationalization is obviously a subject to which the First Committee has devoted great attention over the past few years, in an effort not only to engage in self-examination but also to try to see how the Committee can better adapt itself to a changing world in which change is important and profound but not

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

yet complete. Obviously, rationalization cannot be a one-off exercise. It must be conducted over a period of time, with the results being checked and evaluated and constant readjustments made every year. Tribute should be paid, Mr. Chairman, to your predecessor Ambassador von Wagner, who, with his customary energy and structured approach, forced the Committee to consider ideas and to move forward and to do so in fact at a pace much faster than is customary for this Committee, and then it would have been without the momentum he generated personally in this exercise.

We will, of course, be hearing the general views of all our colleagues but, in the interests of brevity, perhaps you will allow me, Sir, to go straight to the paper that I understand some members of the Bureau have prepared, and of which some copies are mysteriously available in this room. I would, of course, suggest that the quicker this paper is placed on everybody's desk, the more objective-oriented our discussion will be. I say this because at first sight it reads like a very good paper. It is a well-informed document and we think that by going into its specifics we can move forward at some speed. In considering the ideas which interested delegations will put forward on this paper or have put forward in this paper, we must of course discuss our evaluation of what has been called the "structured discussion" of specific items, an experiment that was conducted for the first time this year. The experiment has been only a qualified success. There were times when great interest was generated and there were other times when slots were very empty. I would imagine that that is part of what can be expected when one is doing an exercise for the first time, but the important point is that it is really much too early to reach any final evaluation on the concept of "structured discussion" on specific items. I think we should continue to do this for another year or two and try to evaluate it only after seeing how it performs at different times and in different years. The idea is good. The idea of informal consultations is, in fact, essential to the work of the First Committee. Perhaps the use of the word "structured" gave the wrong impression to people, and whenever the final resolution is considered, I would submit that we should consider whether the word "structured" should be used or not, or whether some softer, low-key terminology could be used in the interests of highlighting the informal nature of the discussions rather than their "structured" nature.

Those informal discussions are going to be very vital next year, which will be a time of deep movement, doubt and self-examination. As members know, among the draft resolutions which we will be considering in the First Committee this year is the proposal for a special session on disarmament in 1996. That proposal itself arises from the feeling of many delegations that the time is slowly approaching when we will have to ask questions such as what direction is disarmament taking? What is the agenda for the next decade or decades? How is that agenda to be defined? In what forum should the discussions take place? How, for example, are security matters to be considered along with disarmament matters? How important is security in the disarmament framework? What exactly does security mean?

These are deep questions, which the First Committee has to consider and decide upon. This cannot be done in formal sessions. Initially, it can be done only in informal sessions, which is why the essence of next year's work will lie in the informal sessions.

In past discussions in the informal sessions here, my delegation has also had occasion to point out that the format of this particular Room is not conducive to a proper, considered informal discussion. This Room, in which most of us are looking at other people's backs while others are trying to save their backs from the people behind them, is, as I said, not conducive to informal discussion, which requires a degree of face-to-face eye contact, which, unfortunately, is not possible in Conference Room 4. My delegation has had occasion to point this out to the Committee and to request that additional conference room facilities be sought. Unfortunately, whenever the matter has come up, we have found that additional conference room facilities were not available because they had already been allocated to other users.

We have managed to bumble along this year but I do not think that we will be able to do so next year, which is why markers have to be placed, as of now, to ensure that, at next year's session of the First Committee, additional conference and office room space is available to the First Committee for informal work.

Concerning the paper itself, which I presume delegations will see, I would therefore request the incorporation of three ideas. The first is to consider whether the word "structured" might not be softened in some way, because it gives the wrong impression.

Secondly, when we talk of the establishment of deadlines — and we know that this is a problem, it came up this year, when there was a constant backwards movement of deadlines because they were cutting into the informal discussion itself — I think that we should clearly choose and establish deadlines that come only after the informal discussions are over. It should be made clear in the wording that we are not saying that deadlines should be set once the informal discussions are over; no, the choice should be made earlier, but it should be such that the deadlines fall only after the informal discussions have taken place, and preferably on Mondays, because it helps to have a weekend in between.

Thirdly, an operative paragraph which, I am sure, will discuss ways and means and resources, should clearly mention the need for additional conference room space. You can go ahead and request either "additional conference room space for informal meetings" or simply "additional conference room space", but those four words should figure in any operative paragraph that addresses ways and means and resources.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I have stated, the members of the Bureau have been paying particular attention to the possibility of submitting a draft resolution on this issue to the Committee. As of now, the draft is still under discussion, but I see no problem in requesting the Secretary to circulate it informally because, as I said, it has yet to be formally submitted to the Committee. Informal consideration of the document, however, might shed some light on this item and assist us in considering it.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank you, Sir, for having convened this meeting on the rationalization of the work of the First Committee. We believe that it is very timely. We are also grateful to you for your clear introduction of the item.

The First Committee has before it many and very various issues of great importance to the international community and the Committee's history teaches us that it is not possible to reach agreement on all the items on its agenda, but that what we can do — or at least attempt to do — is to understand the positions of the various groups or individual delegations better. That is why we believe that the process that began many years ago — but which received a major impulse last year under the chairmanship of Ambassador Adolf von Wagner of Germany — must continue. As the representative of Pakistan has just said, we must keep this process under constant review in this forum.

The important thing is to inject greater dynamism into our work and, above all, better focus it to avoid any undue waste of time. As members have seen this year, there have been many meetings and many hours spent in vain in the First Committee. What, then, have we learned and what could we do to improve our work?

As I said, we need to make our discussions more dynamic. Up to now, we have had two very clearly defined phases: a general debate, which is less a debate than a series of monologues, and decision-making on draft resolutions, the contents of some of which, unfortunately, have not enjoyed the in-depth discussion warranted by the importance of the items they cover. This year, we have begun what we call the third phase, the so-called "structured discussion". As the Chairman and Ambassador Kamal have rightly pointed out, this has also been a repetition of the series of monologues heard in the general debate.

My impression, after many years of participating in the work of the First Committee, is that we lack an initial phase, one that should occur before the general debate. I would venture to suggest for representatives' consideration the following idea: we should have a kind of "warm-up week". Instead of arriving here and embarking on the general debate on the very first day, we would have a week of meetings in which the various groups or delegations could report and present their ideas on what they want the First Committee to do that year.

Ideas could be put forward, for example, such as those presented by the Non-Aligned Movement concerning the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Ideas might be presented on some of the draft resolutions that are new this year. That would help us, firstly, to get an idea of the direction in which the discussion is going, and then the general debate to be held the following week would be little less lumbering and, most importantly, be better informed about what we are doing in the First Committee.

As members know, what happens now is that we come here and many of us — and I include myself in this — rehearse our speeches of last year on the various items and there is very little new we can put in. The general debate would be much less lumbering if we had "warm-up week" I referred to.

However, we also need to find a way to encourage greater informality in our work. We need to find a way — and I think Pakistan's proposal on this is a good one — to meet in rooms where it is possible to have a full and easy exchange of opinions. So, in the text that the Bureau is apparently preparing, I would ask that consideration be given to the possibility of including a fourth, initial phase of very informal exchanges of views about the intentions of delegations for that particular session of the General Assembly. This would avoid, among other things, the useless repetition of some resolutions — fortunately this is happening less often — in the Committee, and would make delegations much more careful about what kinds of proposal they put to the Committee.

Mr. Ramaker (Netherlands): Like the two previous speakers I wish to thank you, Sir, for calling this meeting on — as the title of the document (A/49/579) that you quoted states — "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee". We think that indeed this meeting is very timely and that it is quite useful to discuss here today, in a brainstorming session, how to improve our working methods.

Indeed, this meeting this morning and, I hope, also this afternoon, will take place under the guise of revitalizing our work, increasing its effectiveness and making it, where possible, more rational and more effective: in other words, making the Committee an ideal forum in which, at the end of the day, we would come to a number of decisions.

We think that it is important for the First Committee to organize its work in such a way that the outcome — because, in the end, that is what counts — is the optimal result. As Ambassador Marín Bosch said, we cannot agree on everything but at least we should not leave any avenue unexplored in reaching the best result possible. For that we have to look closely at the way we work.

Like many other delegations, we see value in the general debate but we also see that the general debate has, over the years, become a series of monologues; not unimportant monologues, because they highlight the positions of delegations, but nevertheless they are only a beginning. So, what is needed in addition to the general debate, is another method of work that would give the maximum opportunity to delegations to talk to each other, to consult, to refer to capitals if necessary, but at any rate to make sure that there are no misunderstandings on where delegations or groups of delegations stand. In this way we could also prevent the surprises that sometimes arise and that could be avoided by having this type of consultation taking place.

This year we have had the first experience of another method of organizing our work, namely, the three-phase approach with the middle phase being the "structured" informal discussions, as they were called. We have not yet reached a final conclusion on whether these discussions were useful or on what precisely was their purpose. Nevertheless, we, like previous speakers, are inclined to a favourable position on this method of work. We also think that it is too early to make a final judgement. As with other subjects in multilateral diplomacy, things take their time, and that is certainly true of changes in working habits that have existed for so long in a Committee, such as the First Committee, that has its own traditions.

Indeed, we think that it is too early for final conclusions on these informal, "structured" discussions. It seems to us that in principle they offer a very valuable vehicle for, as I said earlier, making sure that delegations know from each other exactly where they stand, what their positions are, where the flexibility is, where they can accommodate the concerns of others, and where their vital interests emerge and are at stake, so that in the end such discussions will enable us to get the maximum result from the First Committee that can be reached.

When it comes to the rationalization of our work, we hope that the Committee will find a way. We think rationalization serves a valuable purpose and, like the Ambassador of Pakistan, we think that additional conference services, in the form of a conference room that would allow for a really informal exchange of views and for informal consultations, would be worth considering. Our delegation, and I am sure the same goes for other delegations, operates under the general instruction that such services should be provided within the financial means that are available, but I think they could be accommodated. I wholeheartedly endorse the suggestion by the Ambassador of Pakistan to look into the possibility of giving the Committee extra conference facilities.

I should also like to address, for a moment, the scheduling of our meetings. As Ambassador Marín Bosch, I believe, said, we should also see where we can make better use of our time. Going by our experience this year, I do note that there are certain gaps in our schedule that are not being used to the fullest for informal consultations simply because delegations are scattered all over New York in their respective Missions. I think that this is a problem that may not be an easy one to solve, but we should address it. The First Committee, as it works now, is of course also something like a marketplace for ideas and initiatives, and we should see to it that we make use of that function of the First Committee to the fullest extent possible.

In conclusion, we look back on this year's new working methods with feelings that may be a little mixed but, on the other hand, tend very much towards the positive. We do think that we are on the right track when it comes to creating conditions whereby we arrive at a fuller understanding of where we stand on the various issues — and, indeed, they are very varied — that we have before us in the First Committee.

Mr. Salmi (Finland): We believe that the rationalization of the work of the First Committee should be continued. In this connection, I should like to thank you personally, Mr. Chairman, and, through you, the Bureau, for the efforts you have made to implement some of the results of our consultations at the last session.

I should like to say a few words about the general framework. We do not see rationalization as a question concerning just one Committee, just one group of experts, but as part of a wider effort to strengthen and revitalize the General Assembly. Strengthening the ability of the First Committee to deal with current issues would enhance the role of the General Assembly in general as the central organ of the United Nations system. The natural aim should therefore be to restore the role of the First Committee as the main political committee of the General Assembly, as it was conceived to be.

As part of the rationalization effort, we also support a review of the disarmament agenda. So far, this review has not received the attention it deserves, and I have therefore listened with great interest to what has been said on this issue. Instead of dealing with a number of obsolete items on the current agenda and draft resolutions that are repeated from one year to another, the First Committee should be able to focus on tasks that truly contribute to international peace and security in today's world. These should cover both disarmament issues and security issues of a broader nature.

General Assembly resolution 48/87 adopted last year outlined a new structure for the Committee's work. This trial year has proved that this path is worth pursuing. In our further work we should remember that the aim of the thematic approach was not to duplicate lengthy statements in which well-known positions are repeated year after year. To the contrary, the aim was to move from that kind of general debate into a more lively exchange of views. We hope that the time used for the traditional type of general debate can be further shortened.

Naturally, the thematic part of the First Committee's work needs to be developed on the basis of this year's experience. Next year, we hope to have a more focused debate on key issues. The thematic discussion should also be seen as preparing the ground for the consideration of draft resolutions.

We regard rationalization work as a continuing and evolving process. Step by step, in many daily management issues, the role of the Chairman of the Committee and the other Bureau members, as well as that of the secretariat, are important. But the Committee as a whole should be ready to show leadership by taking decisions when they are needed.

We welcome, at this juncture, the initiative of taking decisions on rationalization at this year's General Assembly session, and we hope that this will represent a further step in the ongoing rationalization process.

Mr. Stelzer (Austria): I should like to join previous speakers in thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for having convened this meeting and, expressing our gratitude for your setting the agenda in such an articulate manner.

I do agree with what has been said by previous speakers, namely, that the process of rationalization is a gradual one, a step-by-step one. Every year, we try to improve the work of the First Committee, within the limits of consensus. Last year, as has been pointed out, was a very important one: we had substantive consultations on the rationalization of work, and although we could not reach consensus on a draft resolution, we were able to arrive at a broad common denominator in terms of the structure our work is to follow.

My delegation would like to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for taking the ideas put forward during last year's consultations into consideration when defining this year's work, when you put some of the consensus ideas expressed last year through a kind of a trial run.

As has already been pointed out, it might be too early to draw definite conclusions on the value of how we have been approaching this new structure this year. We seem to be in agreement that more time is needed for intensive and focused consultations on the items under consideration and for a really focused and "structured" discussion. When we approached phase two, the structured debate, many delegations had very different views on how it should be handled: whether it should complement the first phase, of general debate, or whether it should rather play, into the third phase, consideration of the specific draft resolutions that will be submitted.

My delegations has views on how this process has worked this year, and they are more positive than those of earlier speakers. We have the feeling that the general debate this year was more structured: quite a few of the statements were more precise, shorter, more focused. Of course, there were a lot of repetitions. Although the world is changing, not everything is changing; some things stay the same, by which we mean things in the general debate. But we feel that there has been an improvement here too.

Many delegations participated in the "structured" discussion during the second phase. Even here, we noted some repetition and some restatement of old positions. But, at the same time, there were quite a few very frank statements that touched on issues that were close to delegations' interests. The second phase could thus fulfil the expectations of quite a few different schools of thought in the Committee. It could complement the first phase, in that we continue focusing on a few items close to our hearts and to our interests. At the same time, these items lead into the third phase, because the draft resolutions reflect the items to which we pay greater attention. Hence, this "structured" debate could serve as an excellent bridge between the first and third phases.

You, Mr. Chairman, referred to a paper setting out the efforts of the Bureau to draw conclusions from the work of the first phase of this session's debate. I believe the paper has just been distributed, and I thank you, Sir, for making it available. The paper seems to be a very cautious, conservative effort to take stock of what has happened as a result of last year's consultations and of a certain common denominator in this year's work thus far. It seems not to preclude further development and takes very good account of the gradual approach and of the dynamic process of rationalization, as it has been described during this meeting.

My delegation agrees that we should speak of a phased approach. The three-phase approach we defined last year turned out to be very difficult to put into practice, so it might be better to speak only of a "phased approach" without defining it or limiting it to a certain number of phases, because in fact we have more than three phases: we have the general debate; we have the structured discussion; we have the consideration of all draft resolutions; we have action on the draft resolutions; then, of course, we have the last phase, the question of Antarctica.

We devote considerable interest to the second phase, the "structured" discussion. While "structured", it is not supposed to limit delegations. "Structured" means that we adopt a thematic approach, as we did this year, proceeding item by item pursuant to resolution 48/87, in which we subsumed all relevant items under 10 headings. Thus, the course of discussion becomes predictable; delegations can prepare themselves to a certain degree and respond to statements made by other delegations in the informal discussion. We also support an informal mode of discussion, with conference services provided. We greatly appreciate the fact that no records are taken, so that the discussion is stimulated.

We also give attention to the proper environment. Some previous speakers thought that it might be better to go to a smaller meeting room. Our experience this year shows that there was a lot of interest in the second phase, so much interest that we could not possibly have moved to a smaller room, for no such room could have accommodated all interested delegations. Hence, there are logistic limitations. This informal mode should be made use of and expanded in coming years.

The draft resolution, which has been distributed in preliminary form, avoids micro-management of the work of the First Committee. It focuses on the most important points — on the structure – without preventing incoming Chairmen in succeeding years from adding their own ideas or from exploiting their prerogative of suggesting the structure of the Committee's work, within the terms of the structure outlined in the draft resolution.

One paragraph, however, reflects some of our experiences of this year. For example, it expresses the conviction that statements in the general debate should be more structured, more precise, more concise; it does not limit statements to a certain number of minutes, but only recommends that statements should not exceed a certain time limit. This might help structure the debate a little better.

The draft also refers to holding the second-phase meetings in an informal mode but with appropriate conference services, and to structuring the discussion according to broad topic areas listed in resolution 48/87. It refers also to a deadline for the submission of draft resolutions; this year, we found that we had to postpone the deadline, because the original deadline cut through the second phase. As Ambassador Kamal pointed out, the deadline should be after the end of the second phase. Here, we do think that paragraph 4 (c) of the draft should be slightly reworded, because it says that the deadline should be "established". What the draft means, of course, is that the deadline should be fixed for after the end of the second phase, so, as suggested by Ambassador Kamal, better drafting is called for.

The draft also recommends that the consideration of all draft resolutions should follow the same clustering into broad topic areas as was adopted for the second phase. This reflects the dynamics of our work.

Another paragraph urges the Secretary-General to provide, taking into account existing resource constraints, the appropriate means for the work programme of the fiftieth session; it does not speak of additional conference space, but as has been pointed out, it might be appropriate to add such a reference. We could certainly support the suggested reference to

> "appropriate means, additional conference space, and resources to permit the implementation of the work programme for the fiftieth session of the First Committee".

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having made the effort to give delegations the opportunity to express their thoughts regarding rationalization in the context of a dynamic process, and for having taken it upon yourself to formulate the experience of last year and this year in a preliminary draft resolution and to present the draft to the Committee. Not only do we support the draft but, as a member of the Bureau, we have joined in sponsoring it.

Mr. Poptchev (Bulgaria): My delegation too would like to contribute to this useful exchange on the issue of the rationalization of the work of the First Committee. As we have previously stated, the practice of clustering agenda items has proved to be an appropriate step. The "three-phase" approach to structuring the work of the Committee has been accepted by delegations as a natural and logical one, and our work has consequently developed in an orderly, smooth fashion.

On the other hand, my delegation believes that certain further improvements could be considered. In this context, we would like to point to the failure by the Committee to address certain "key questions" within each of the major topic areas, as envisaged in the preliminary draft resolution.

Firstly, we think that had the "structured" discussion been set out in detail, the Committee could have considered, within the topic of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, questions such as the scope of the ban, the structure and functioning of the implementing organization and the composition of its executive council. In suggesting this, we do not mean to involve the First Committee in negotiations — which are the prerogative of the Conference on Disarmament -- but rather to stimulate political support and to enlarge the conceptual understanding of future disarmament and arms-control agreements and other major arms-control and disarmament issues.

Disarmament conventions are becoming ever more complex and elaborate. They are also intended to be instruments that have universal adherence, and so political support for and understanding of these conventions by States that are not directly involved in the negotiations is a particular necessity. The discussion of relevant "key questions" in the First Committee presents a good opportunity for a further attempt to coordinate the political will of States on major political issues and to broaden the intellectual basis and universality of disarmament instruments. In short, we find the consideration of the so-called "key questions" useful.

Secondly, in terms of possible improvements, my delegation would bring to the Committee's attention the possibility of introducing a period of one or two days of consultations, not only on draft resolutions and decisions, but also on general trends and developments in the arms-control area. This suggested consultation period should be scheduled between the second and the third phases of the Committee's present timetable.

The third point my delegation wishes to make is related to the overall status of disarmament machinery. It is, by all accounts, undergoing a transformation, this is only natural, as international relations themselves are in a state of flux. We should therefore not be too ambitious in seeking rationalization of the First Committee on its own: the international community has not yet found the best organizational approach to the effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament and of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We would therefore submit that the arms-control and disarmament community should apply an integrated approach to the issue of rationalization of the work of the disarmament machinery as a whole. This should be reflected in the agenda of the First Committee and in today's discussion of the issue.

Mr. King (United States of America): On behalf of my delegation also, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening today's meeting. This is, in effect, the first chance we have had to review the results of the rationalization exercise undertaken as a result of last year's Assembly resolution 48/87.

The major new factor in that rationalization was the phased approach to our work, especially the addition of the new phase on "structured" debate. Frankly, my delegation has found the results far more useful than we had expected. If there are, perhaps, problems in this area, they are attributable to the newness of the experiment itself and to the fact that delegations need to see how it works in principle before they can begin to improve their own methods of contributing to the debate. In that sense, my delegation is prepared to work further to enhance the usability of the debate phase.

We also need to test further the other rationalization ideas that have been mentioned. The idea of trying to make our conference space more amenable to informal discussions is indeed a good one. A smaller conference space would, of course, carry with it the problems other speakers have mentioned, such as the fact that it might not accommodate the members interested in this kind of discussion. What we may need to think about, therefore, is not so much a smaller conference room, but some way, if it is possible, physically to reconfigure the room we have in order to accommodate those who wish to have a more informal discussion but without the squeezing, difficulty in hearing and other problems that occur in an overcrowded facility.

I think also that we need to consider another idea that has already been mentioned: added flexibility in scheduling our meetings. In this sense, I believe that the Bureau needs to be able to adapt much more quickly to the Committee's changing needs for discussion. Our workload during any given year seems to have peaks and nodes of work, and the meeting schedule has to be adapted to that. For that reason, I think that the idea of giving more authority to the Bureau to schedule these meetings, which I saw expressed in the preliminary draft resolution that was just distributed, is a good one.

In any case, I think it is important not to overload the rationalization agenda. As another speaker mentioned, we should not let rationalization of the First Committee become a substitute for our inability to rationalize the substance of disarmament, because there are no structural modifications that we can make to the First Committee that could compensate for our lack of ability to agree on the disarmament issues, needs and priorities that we face. If we could do that, I believe that the organization and structure of the First Committee would easily follow.

We would therefore agree with previous speakers to move forward with deliberations on the rationalization ideas that have been submitted. We need especially further to test the idea of an issue-based debate. It shows real promise in doing something very important: bridging the gap between the formal debate structure that we have in the first phase and the very informal hallway, coffee-room negotiation of resolutions. This additional phase shows an ability to improve both communication and understanding on the specific issues we face.

Lastly, having taken just an initial look at the preliminary draft resolution that the Bureau has put out, our impression is that, at first glance, it seems to fit the spirit of the rationalization discussion that we are having now. This draft may indeed become a good basis for further discussion, and we also hope that it might be used as the basis this year for a final First Committee resolution on rationalization.

Mr. Chandra (India): At the outset, my delegation would like to thank you, Sir, for having initiated the discussion on this subject. We would also like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to thank Ambassador von Wagner for having started us on this exercise.

I should particularly like to thank you also, Sir, for the papers that you have circulated on these matters. We agree with the broad thrust of the paper on rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee that has been circulated. Together with the previous speakers who share this view, I agree that it represents the spirit of what we are trying to do.

I also agree with previous speakers that we need to keep this item under constant review and keep upgrading our thinking and comments on the matter. We should, however, ensure that, in terms of agenda items, the priorities set out at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament are kept in mind.

Turning to this year's experience, it is our feeling that the informal debate was not as successful as we had hoped. Perhaps that is because our expectations were so high, but it is a fact that during that phase the exchanges had some sparkle. It is our feeling that we should continue in that mode and that, with experience, performance will improve considerably and this particular sector of the session will perhaps become one of the most useful. We therefore feel that it is an area that should be retained. We agree with the idea expressed by some delegations that we should perhaps give it a soft cover and not call it "structured". However, let us explore these ideas.

Basically, as my delegation sees it, there are four phases: the opening debate, the informal debate, the consideration of resolutions and action taken.

Regarding the opening debate, I am greatly attracted by the idea put forward by Ambassador Bosch that there should be a warm-up. I think that cold starts are bad, and therefore the warm-up idea is attractive. However, I wonder whether we would have sufficient time in that phase to have simultaneous action along the lines that Ambassador Bosch suggested, namely, to have the debate and the statements and, at the same time, have group meetings where issues are discussed and ideas exchanged. That in turn would provide a natural feed-in to the next phase — the informal debate. In the informal debate, apart from exchanges in the way to which we have been accustomed, perhaps that phase could be utilized for resolution-building and consensus-forming, and then flow in naturally to the third and fourth phases.

These are some of our very preliminary thoughts, about areas that I feel should be looked at carefully. We would certainly like to see the idea of the informal debate retained, keeping in mind that arrangements should be made for conference rooms that would accommodate most of the delegations. We attach particular importance to this.

As regards the deadlines question, we feel that deadlines should of course follow the informal debates because we regard that period as providing an input for the resolutions that are being proposed.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): First of all, my delegation would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all the delegations involved in producing the preliminary draft resolution on the rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee for their efforts.

With a draft of this kind, we feel we are really on the right track, that is, establishing a pattern that will make it clear that the rationalization of the work of the Committee is a continuing, ongoing process; the draft will certainly help us keep this issue to the forefront of our words and help prepare us for next year.

When we consider the rationalization process and its objective, we must certainly take into account what our experiences were before we started the process and recall what misgivings we had then. Those misgivings focused in particular on the fact that, between the general debate and the voting period, we had a period that was not really filled by substance but only by informal consultations on draft resolutions, and no draft resolutions were discussed in detail in the Committee *per se*.

We started this year with the right approach — a "structured" discussion — but we are all aware that we are far from finding the ideal solution. An ideal solution is not something we can achieve by procedure alone, and we must be aware of the fact that we, ourselves, the delegations, are the ones who must contribute to making the debate lively, to making it a debate that will help us to find solutions for certain draft resolutions. In essence, drawing from the initial experiences we had this year — which were encouraging in some areas but not so satisfying in others — we must be aware that making this phase more effective entails preparing for it when it comes round again next year.

As we all know, the ways in which delegations will prepare for the phase will differ because delegations have different patterns regarding the way they receive instructions and the degree of latitude they have on certain issues. Delegations that are bound by written instructions might have to try to get written instructions on certain issues for the "structure" phase, and others that have more latitude should be encouraged to use it to develop common positions during that phase.

We particularly welcome the operative paragraphs of the draft that make it quite clear that we are in an ongoing, continuing process and that we will look into the matter against next year.

We thank the Bureau for its efforts and hope that the preliminary draft resolution will result in a draft resolution that will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I join with previous speakers in thanking you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Bureau for the time, effort and imagination that I know you are bringing to the task of rationalizing the work and reforming the agenda of our Committee.

I too would say that our experience this year has been mixed. It may not have lived up to some expectations. It is true that we have had a series of monologues and it is also true that we have had some rehearsals of formal statements from the general debate but, at the same time, we have also had some illuminating and more spontaneous exchanges.

Change in the multilateral field takes time, and we think that this experiment should continue. I am hopeful that next year, and beyond, our informal debate will be more fruitful as delegations become accustomed to change as they come to the New York prepared for such informal debates.

I would endorse the remarks made about the need for a setting more conducive to dynamic, informal discussions. Some room other than this one would be much more conducive to that end and would provide a setting more like that of working groups focused on specific subjects.

I would also endorse as quite intriguing the proposals that were made by Ambassador Marín Bosch for an informal warm-up session that would enable us to describe our intentions before having to address a written text and for a setting that would enable us to discuss ideas, particularly new ideas "and new suggestions" rather than being bound to written and prepared remarks about proposals that had already found expression in formal resolutions.

Finally, I think all these changes would contribute to the achievement of a long-standing Canadian objective which I know is shared by many delegations — namely, to better integrate the work of the First Committee into the broader international security agenda so as to deepen our understanding of the concepts of preventive diplomacy, confidence-building and post-conflict peace-preserving measures, and also of peace-keeping more generally.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joins previous speakers in thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this meeting on the rationalization of the work of the First Committee. I will limit my comments to the subject of the week which has been allocated to the "structured discussion" of specific items and to the preliminary draft resolution distributed a little while ago.

As some delegations have mentioned, the results of the "structured" discussion of specific items were not as satisfactory or as productive as we had anticipated. However, it was worthwhile, and, as Ambassador Kamal suggested, perhaps we should continue with it for one or two more years and then conduct an evaluation.

Moreover, we think more participation should be encouraged in the "structured" discussion of specific items, and perhaps delegations should also be encouraged to bring their draft resolutions before the First Committee during that period so that informal consultations on them can be conducted and subsequent meetings can be more productive. We are convinced that, if the draft resolutions were discussed in that week, we would have less controversy over their substance later in the work of the First Committee.

We also support the idea expressed by Ambassador Kamal on the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions, which would follow the second stage of the work of the First Committee — that is, the informal week. The idea expressed by Ambassador Marín Bosch on a warm-up week was also interesting, but we think that if the general debate followed the warm-up week, it would become less interesting, more monotonous. Despite that, we think the idea is worth examining, and perhaps in due course we should consider the merits of Ambassador Marín Bosch's proposal.

As to the preliminary draft resolution just distributed, we have given it some preliminary consideration and it seems to be balanced. However, we would like to refer to one or two minor points in the preliminary draft.

In the draft, where the General Assembly recognizes the need to allow more time during the annual sessions of the First Committee to conduct intensive and focused consultations on the items under its consideration, we think we should replace the notion of "more" with, perhaps "adequate", because we are of the view that, with fewer formal meetings, fewer delegations will find it possible to attend the Committee's meetings, and then the Committee is deprived of hearing their views on the issues involved. This was the case with the week allocated to the informal general debate in this session. The small delegations, especially, find it difficult to attend informal meetings.

At the point in the preliminary draft where the General Assembly requests the incoming Chairman of the First Committee to continue consultations, we wonder whether this recommendation precludes the possibility of further consultations under the auspices of the current Chairman, such as have been held in previous years.

Mr. Dembinski (Poland): I think that this debate has been extremely useful, and I would like to thank the Bureau for the thoughtful preliminary draft resolution we have just received.

I would just like to make a few remarks concerning two words which are used in this text. First is the word "structure". The work of the First Committee has been "structured" or divided, into four distinct phases, which is extremely useful approach to organization. But the real innovation lies in the introduction of the second phase, which is called a "structured" discussion. I think it should not really be a "structured" discussion — and that word has already been criticized by some speakers — it should be called, rather, a "thematic" discussion. I think that, rather than discussing specific issues, in the second phase we should discuss broader themes.

The second word which I think is very important is the word "informal". What do we mean by "informal"? Of course, the seating arrangements are a physical part of the informality of discussions, but having a freer discussion means not only having statements of the precise positions of Governments, but also having some new ideas, and to achieve this freer exchange of views I think we should take a further step and have the informal discussion introduced by informal statements so that discussion would be stimulated.

Probably it is not for the Chairman of the Committee to put himself on the line in such an exercise, but perhaps someone could be invited to highlight, in each one of the themes discussed, the most controversial and opposing views, put them on the table and see what the reactions of the various delegations might be. Then we might have a more lively and really more informal discussion during the second stage, one that would certainly help us prepare for later, formal discussions on specific agenda items and on specific resolutions.

Mr. King (United States of America): I should like to make a point regarding procedure. We have before us now a preliminary draft resolution from the Bureau. Does the Chairman intend to have a more thorough debate on the elements of the preliminary draft, or will the debate we are having now suffice to make any adjustments necessary before the draft is formally submitted?

Further debate that would be good, because perhaps some of us may have some more specific comments on the draft after we have had a chance to look at it more carefully. On the other hand, if the discussion we have had so far is to be considered sufficient, there are a couple of comments I should like to make on the text itself.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* With regard to the point raised by the representative of the United States, I should like to say that the members of the Bureau are still considering the preliminary draft resolution the text of which has been circulated informally to delegations. However, the ideas being put forward this morning and those that will be forthcoming later today will assist the Bureau in preparing the final version of the draft, which will, of course, come out in a timely fashion. Any ideas that may be put forward will be extremely useful to us in preparing the definitive draft text.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): My point is basically the same as that of the representative of the United States, namely, that if we go straight into the submission of this draft resolution we may not have time for the consideration of any specific drafting amendments that may be necessary.

My delegation has also heard just now some amendments that we would like to suggest for consideration; we can make those now. But they will be for the text, before us only, and I will enumerate them.

With reference to the "structural" dimension, the word "structured" should be replaced by the words "informal thematic", so that the phrase would now read "informal thematic discussion of specific items ...".

Concerning deadlines, the words "shall be established" in the preliminary draft give the impression that a discussion on when deadlines should be fixed will start only after the second phase has been completed, which is not the intention of the drafters. I would suggest that the words "be established" should be replaced by the word "come", so that the deadlines "shall come after the end of the second phase".

The draft should also contain a reference to "additional conference room facilities" in the appropriate place.

The drafting changes that we are suggesting do not yet take into account the suggestion by the representative of Mexico. We need guidance from you, Mr. Chairman, as to whether, before the final draft is submitted, you would like to have an informal discussion with some interested delegations as to how that particular idea is to be drafted and inserted, or whether the consensus is that it should be left out. We need some breathing space in which to consider this between now and the actual submission of a draft resolution.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* This afternoon we shall be continuing with this exchange of views on general aspects and also in connection with any suggestion that may be made on the informal text circulated to delegations.

Once we have completed this exchange of views in the First Committee, I intend to have an open meeting with delegations wishing to speak so that we can consider the draft in a more structured way, if I can still use that word, so as to prepare the final text to be submitted formally to the Committee.

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 3 p.m. today. Following it, there will be an open-ended, informal meeting for all delegations interested in considering the informal draft that has been circulated. The informal meeting will be held in Conference Room 8.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.12, United Republic of Tanzania; A/C.1/49/L.23, United States of America; A/C.1/49/L.19, Georgia; A/C.1/49/L.15 and A/C.1/49/L.22, Viet Nam; A/C.1/49/L.25 and A/C.1/49/L.28, United Republic of Tanzania; and A/C.1/49/L.44, Argentina.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.18

General Assembly Official Records

General Assembly

First Committee

18th Meeting

Thursday, 10 November 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda item 73 *(continued)*

Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee (A/49/579)

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* This afternoon delegations will continue to exchange views on the agenda item. This morning we had an interesting debate on the rationalization of the work and the reform of the agenda of this Committee, and there was some discussion of the preliminary draft resolution that had been introduced informally to the Committee.

This afternoon we will continue with statements on general matters to do with these questions. Then we will perhaps hold over any specific discussion of amendments to this draft until the informal discussion among directly interested delegations, to be held in Conference Room 8.

Mr. Fasehun (Nigeria): I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss once again this afternoon the rationalization of our work in the First Committee.

The rationalization is, of course, an ongoing process. I wish to thank your predecessor, Mr. Chairman, for his efforts in the rationalization and streamlining of the work of this very important Committee.

For almost three years in a row, we have been involved in discussing the question of rationalization. The fruits of that discussion are contained in the paper that was presented to the reconvened session of the First Committee last September. Some elements of that paper have now been turned into the preliminary draft resolution which you, Mr. Chairman, and the representatives of three other countries — the members of the Bureau — are proposing.

We have taken time to study the paper, and we wish to thank you once again for it. We have certain concerns, in that this is the first year that we have experimented with a new format for debate and discussion and I think we need more time to digest fully the reform that is in place. We believe that there cannot yet be a definitive pronouncement as to the effectiveness or otherwise of the reforms that have been made in the last two or three years.

This year we are still trying to adjust to the reforms already made. If, therefore, we do not utilize all the time available to us, I do not think we can conclude thereby that reform has been a failure. It seems to us that we need two or three more years before we can pronounce definitively on how the reforms we have undertaken have gone.

I should also like to point out that part of the problem that we have is that, in reform, everything cannot really be put on paper, nor should we really be forced into a strait-jacket. We have noted the time allotted for debate, and we have also noted that under the preliminary draft resolution proposed by the Chairman there is a suggestion for the consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items.

I fear that we do not understand what that particular suggestion means. Are we going to start again with an open-ended drafting session? Or is it going to turn into another session of the Disarmament Commission? There are

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

already various draft resolutions that have been submitted to the First Committee for general debate and general comments. We fear that if this were the case for all the aforementioned draft resolutions too, it would create difficulties: rather than lead to a meeting of minds, it might even complicate matters and lead to the further proliferation of draft resolutions, as well as causing more division within the Committee itself.

We are of the opinion that countries that are interested in submitting or that are submitting draft resolutions could contact interested parties and circulate their draft resolutions. We do have a traditional practice of contacting each other in-house to discuss draft resolutions where there may be difficulties. We therefore wish to have clarification regarding the Chairman's suggestion on the consideration of all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items.

Finally, we wish to see enumerated by cluster all the items that we have agreed upon. Many may think that this is redundant, but since these will be the resolutions that formally present the outcome of our discussions in this session of the Committee, it would not be asking too much if the items that we have identified and that have been arranged in clusters were also to be recapped in this preliminary draft resolution.

Mr. Rhee (Republic of Korea): I should like to join previous speakers in thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this meeting to discuss the rationalization of the work of the First Committee.

I should like to limit my remarks to the general aspects of the rationalization and to come back at a later stage to the specific wording of the draft resolution.

Resolution 48/87 laid a solid foundation for us to consider disarmament and international security issues in a more systematic manner. During this session, we have tested the Committee's new approach, and it is my delegation's assessment that our first attempt was successful, though there are some areas that need to be further improved and developed in the future.

My delegation believes that discussions on the thematic approach should be not only further encouraged, but very carefully and prudently organized if we really want to see tangible results from that approach. In this regard, my delegation believes that practical measures should be introduced to facilitate the participation of the various delegations in this room.

My delegation's points are rather simple. First, as many previous speakers have already pointed out and as you, Mr. Chairman, have already indicated, but would not pursue because of the lack of meeting facilities, the setting for our discussion should be more informal. My delegation believes that we have to find out, in coming sessions, how to ensure that the meeting environment is more workable.

Secondly, my delegation believes that it would be much better if we could make the atmosphere of our discussion more lively and thought-provoking. In this regard, I should like to suggest the introduction of a seminar-style discussion into our thematic approach. We could invite, on a voluntary basis, several experts from the various delegations with different views regarding specific agenda items, and on hearing the expert views, delegations would obtain some fresh ideas on the issues concerned. Such an approach could also stimulate participation in our discussions by various delegations.

We are at a very early stage in our rationalization process, and my delegation fully agrees that the process is an ongoing one. There is an oriental proverb that says "Once begun means half done", and I believe the First Committee has launched the process quite successfully and that we can accomplish the task in the near future.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): If no other delegation would like to speak on this item in the Committee, then I shall take it that delegations wish to proceed to the informal meeting on the equally informal draft that has been distributed on the rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4 p.m.

United Nations

A/C.1/49/PV.19

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

19th Meeting
Monday, 14 November 1994, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.3, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, Peru; A/C.1/49/L.11, Kuwait; A/C.1/49/L.10, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.12, Kenya, Mongolia and Indonesia; A/C.1/49/L.13, Kenya, Turkmenistan, Cuba, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Austria and Portugal; A/C.1/49/L.18, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.19, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kuwait, Niger and Jordan; A/C.1/49/L.20, Kenya; A/C.1/49/L.21, Kenya and Armenia; A/C.1/49/L.22, Kenya, Kuwait, Netherlands, Turkmenistan, Cuba and Haiti; A/C.1/40/L.23, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.27, Slovakia; A/C.1/49/L.31, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.35, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, South Africa, Botswana, El Salvador, Swaziland and Costa Rica; A/C.1/49/L.41, Turkmenistan; A/C.1/49/L.42, Belgium, Kenya, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, France, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Spain and Australia.

The Chairman: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will proceed to the next phase of its work, namely, action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items, including "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee" — that is items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153.

At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take a decision on those draft resolutions that appear in cluster 2 of the Chairman's suggested programme, "Other Weapons of Mass Destruction", namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.3 and A/C.1/49/L.13. Then the Committee will proceed to take a decision on those draft resolutions that appear in cluster 3, "Conventional Weapons", draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.6, A/C.1/49/L.23, A/C.1/49/L.27 and A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1.

I understand that some delegations have requested the postponement of a decision on A/C.1/49/L.27. Time permitting, we will then proceed chronologically today up to cluster 6, thus covering draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.42, A/C.1/49/L.43, A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.18, A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.21 and A/C.1/49/L.15. I understand also that some delegations have asked for the postponement of a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18.

Before the Committee proceeds to the stage of taking action on these draft resolutions, I would like to inform members of the following procedure, which the Committee will observe at this stage of our work.

As far as action on each cluster is concerned, delegations will first have an opportunity to introduce draft

---

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

resolutions with regard to any particular cluster. I will then give the floor to those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes with regard to the draft resolutions in that particular cluster.

Subsequently, delegations will have an opportunity to explain their positions or votes before a decision is taken on any or all draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster.

After the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, an opportunity will be given to delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the decision is taken on any or all draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster. In this regard, I would like to urge delegations to kindly make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster, with respect to the statements and explanations of positions or votes concerned.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I would like to urge those members of the Committee who wishing to ask for a recorded vote on any particular resolution to kindly inform the Secretariat of their intention before the Committee begins its action on any individual cluster.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", is sponsored by Gambia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States, and also by Haiti.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I hear no objection. I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 was adopted.

The Chairman: We now move to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". This draft resolution is sponsored by the following delegations: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

In connection with this draft resolution, I should like to read out the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

> "By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.13, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Powers of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference, as well as the decisions contained in the Final Report of the Special Conference, including all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts.
>
> "It should be noted that the Third Review Conference and the Special Conference are Conferences of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties — for example, the seabed Treaty, the biological weapons Convention and the environmental modification Convention — included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference, including the session of the preparatory committee.
>
> "Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 to provide the necessary assistance and required services for the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference and

the Special Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Conference of the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions after the decision.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): The United States supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes, which has just been adopted. We are sympathetic to the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to, and expresses legitimate concern about, the potential hazards that would evolve from the irresponsible disposal of nuclear wastes. Nevertheless, we feel that the First Committee is not the appropriate forum to deal with this matter.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia also supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes. Australia is sympathetic to the main thrust of this draft resolution, which draws attention to, and expresses concern about, the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear wastes which would constitute radiological warfare and its implications for regional and international security.

We have some concerns, however, about the appropriate venue and organization for the consideration of a legally-binding instrument, as referred to in operative paragraph 8. Any decisions in this respect would need to take into account the various competencies and ongoing work of the Conference on Disarmament, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Maritime Organization. At this stage, we are not in a position to judge what recommendations for action might appropriately be directed at which organization. Australia reaffirms, however, its unqualified opposition to the dumping of nuclear wastes by any State or organization that would constitute radiological warfare and have grave implications for the security of all States.

The Chairman: We now move to consider cluster 3, on conventional weapons.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their position on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3.

Mrs. Londoño Jaramillo (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In an effort to speed up the Committee's work, we believe, since there are other draft resolutions with similar objectives, draft decision A/C.1/49/L.6, sponsored by Colombia, should be withdrawn.

Mr. Ekwall (Sweden): I wish to speak in reference to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

Like last year's draft resolution on this Convention, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 contains, in its last preambular paragraph, a reference to the draft resolution on assistance in mine clearance. That draft resolution is dealt with directly in the plenary of the General Assembly. Action on it has not yet been taken by the plenary. Therefore, the blank spaces in the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 remain open for the time being. The Secretariat will, however, fill in the appropriate data with respect to number and date as soon as the draft resolution on assistance in mine clearance has been adopted.

Mr. Liukkonen (Finland): The delegation of Finland would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, concerning the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines.

As Under-Secretary Blomberg emphasized in his statement to the Committee on 18 October, Finland considers the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel land-mines to be an issue deserving urgent international attention. This draft resolution serves to heighten that attention, and rightly so.

The issue itself is at present being negotiated by the States parties to Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on

Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. As a State party, Finland works actively in those negotiations for a stronger Protocol II. We urge those States remaining outside the Convention to adhere and join us in this important negotiation.

Finland considers it very important that the recommendations made by the General Assembly should not be construed as somehow prejudging the outcome of the ongoing negotiations between the States parties.

It is with this concern in mind that Finland reserves its position on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Mr. Florent (France) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation wishes to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines", which was introduced by the delegation of the United States.

France hopes that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote. It is important that on a basic issue such as this the international community should clearly demonstrate, with solidarity, its determination to combat and prevent this veritable scourge, the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines.

In December 1993 my delegation co-sponsored the draft that became resolution 48/75 K. Furthermore, as was recalled in the report (A/49/275) of the Secretary-General, France decided unilaterally in 1993 to enforce a moratorium on the export of all types of anti-personnel land-mines, regardless of their destination. We are also very pleased at the decision taken by more than 20 countries to establish a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines.

Like many other States, France attaches great importance to ending once and for all the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines, which is why we also took the initiative in February 1993 of calling for the convening of an international Conference to review the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, in order to strengthen the provisions of Protocol II on mines and booby traps. That is also why, together with our partners in the European Community, we support every effort by the General Assembly in regard to assistance in demining.

For all these reasons, France would have liked to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, just as it co-sponsored the draft that became resolution 48/75 K. Unfortunately it could not do so, because of the mention in operative paragraph 6 of the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines. We believe that such a reference, which is already contained in the sixth preambular paragraph — more logically in our view, having regard to its political, declaratory nature — would have a negative effect on negotiations under way in the Group of Governmental Experts charged with reviewing the 1980 Convention and its Protocols — above all, Protocol II on mines and booby traps.

As the work of the Group of Governmental Experts clearly shows, there is at this stage no consensus — far from it — on the very principle of a total ban on anti-personnel land-mines. It would seem to us to be preferable, therefore, to avoid further complicating the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, by initiatives which risk being counter-productive at this stage, making more difficult the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, which should lead to agreement between the States parties during the review conference to be convened in September-October 1995.

Similarly, it does not seem clear to us that the reference in operative paragraph 6 to the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines would facilitate the broadest possible adherence to the Convention and its Protocols, a matter which for our delegation is a priority.

In that respect, France welcomes the wish of the United States to become a party to the Convention and its Protocols.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3. I remind delegations that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.6 has been withdrawn and action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.27 has been postponed.

We shall proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines" was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 12th meeting of the Committee on 3 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas,

Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu and Yemen.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", introduced by the representative of Sweden at the fifteenth meeting, on 9 November 1994, is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution L.23, I should like to read the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

> "By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.23, concerning the convening of a review conference on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and its preparatory work by a group of governmental experts, the General Assembly takes note of the decisions by the group of governmental experts to hold an additional meeting in Geneva from 9 to 20 January 1995 and to request the Secretary-General to convene the review conference in Geneva within the time frame 25 September to 13 October 1995.
>
> "The Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to continue furnishing needed assistance and to assure services to the group of governmental experts and to the conference to review the Convention. It should be noted that the review conference will be a conference of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties, for example the Sea-Bed Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Environmental Modification Convention, included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference, including the sessions of the preparatory committee. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization.
>
> "Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the review conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the review conference of the Convention.
>
> "Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States Parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 was adopted.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms", was introduced in its revised form by the representative of Afghanistan at the 15th meeting on 9 November 1994. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects. The 1980 Convention has been reaffirmed today as the cornerstone of the entire process of adopting the necessary legal framework for regulating the use of land-mines and other instruments. Cuba was one of the first countries to ratify the Convention.

Over the years the indiscriminate use of such weapons and the consequences of unregulated exports have confirmed the Convention's relevance and the need to strengthen it in spirit, letter and scope by holding a review conference. The most noble humanitarian calls made by many countries and humanitarian organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, have been heard in the debates of the group of governmental experts preparing for the review conference. However, the group's work will continue to be effective to the extent that the delicate balance of positions and interests in this area is maintained.

Humanitarian arguments should not be used to shield maximalist, selective or discriminatory positions. A future regime banning the use of land-mines will be achievable only if its tenets are compatible with the principles of sovereignty and the right of States to self-defence.

The illusion about the technological reliability of some sophisticated mines produced by certain developed countries is as bad and inhuman as the consequences of the indiscriminate use of conventional mines, which provide defences for developing countries lacking, for economic reasons, access to arsenals of technically advanced weapons. Confidence-building measures should not replace intrusive verification measures, measures incompatible with the principle of sovereignty, and unjustifiable from the technical point of view. The main purpose of the review of the 1980 Convention should be to ensure the maximum universality for that legal instrument, since the minimal number of States parties, which do not include the principal producers, guarantees neither its effectiveness nor its observance by the majority of the international community.

My country will continue to contribute to the negotiating process begun in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, while it reconciles the objectives outlined earlier, objectives inherent in the positions of principle of many developing countries.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines". Australia, once again, supports the draft resolution. It commends the humanitarian concerns of United States Senator Patrick Leahy, which led to this initiative for moratoriums on exports of anti-personnel mines. Australia, however, is one of many countries, some of them sponsors of the draft resolution, that believe that anti-personnel mines can be a legitimate conventional weapon. We can share the objective of replacing them with more humane and viable alternatives, if such can be found, in future.

In the meantime, it is critical that current stocks of anti-personnel mines be replaced with self-destructing and self-deactivating mines. Unless countries such as Australia, which do not currently produce anti-personnel mines, are to become producers, achieving this objective must involve the export of mines. In Australia's view, only self-destructing anti-personnel mines should be exported, and only to States parties to Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects.

Those are the proposals that we, together with a number of colleagues, have made in the group of experts preparing for the 1995 review conference of that Convention. We believe, therefore, that this draft resolution is at odds with achievable short-term means of protecting civilians. In this regard, we appeal to delegations to ask their capitals to demonstrate greater commitment to the spirit of this draft resolution by supporting, in the Geneva group of experts, proposals for a phased-in ban on the use of non-self-destructing anti-personnel mines and on their production and trade, as well as a permanent ban on the export of anti-personnel mines to States not parties to Protocol II.

Mr. Sinirlioğlu (Turkey): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.19 and L.23.

We fully share the view that the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines causes great humanitarian and economic problems. We strongly support the goal of ending the human tragedy they cause. Therefore, we attach great importance to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, which we have adopted by consensus. However, we are not in full agreement with the wording of paragraph 6. We understand the definition of "eventual elimination" in that paragraph as a political goal which we must strive to attain in the future. With that understanding in mind, we joined in the consensus. Had paragraph 6 been put to a separate vote, we would have abstained in that vote.

On the other hand, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects constitutes one of the cornerstone instruments in the field of disarmament. Turkey is a signatory of that Convention. We are following very closely the preparatory process for the review conference of the Convention, which will be convened next year. In that context, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, which has been adopted by consensus, is particularly important. But we are not in full agreement with the wording of certain paragraphs. However, in the spirit of compromise, we joined in the consensus.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19. In that connection, we reaffirm our position on the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines, which we stated at last year's session when a draft resolution on this item was adopted, destined to become General Assembly resolution 48/75. That statement is summarized in document A/C.1/48/SR.28 of 7 January 1994.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): I wish to explain the position of Pakistan on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines". Pakistan joined the consensus on this draft resolution because we share the basic concern that motivated the sponsors to submit the draft resolution. Like them, we are convinced that urgent, concrete measures need to be taken to protect civilians from the effects of the indiscriminate use of land-mines. Pakistan's concern about the effects of land-mines is based on our direct experience with the havoc caused by these weapons. During the Afghan conflict, millions of mines were sowed indiscriminately in all parts of Afghanistan. Over 10 million mines still lie uncleared in that country. Thousands of civilians have been maimed and continue to be injured by those mines. Vast areas of that country have been rendered uninhabitable. More than a million Afghan refugees remain stranded in Pakistan, unable to return to their homeland because of the threat posed by the mines.

While we share the view that specific steps need to be taken to eliminate the threat posed by land-mines, we believe that careful consideration is required on how to achieve that objective. It is necessary to realize that it is not the use of land-mines *per se* that causes problems; rather, it is the indiscriminate use of land-mines that creates havoc. Land-mines are essentially defensive weapons. Properly used, they are an effective means of deterring attacks, and thus have a definite place in the defensive arsenals of States.

However, if they are laid indiscriminately, land-mines assume a different and thoroughly malignant character. The focus, therefore, should be on stopping the indiscriminate use of land-mines. A number of measures could be taken to that end. For instance, it must be ensured that all parties carry out proper mapping of the mines they lay. Mines that are used should be detectable or even self-destructing or self-neutralizing after a period of time. Finally, there should be a legal regime that would treat the indiscriminate use of land-mines as a war crime. The parties that lay these land-mines should be held responsible for their removal once hostilities cease.

Those measures, along with others, are being considered by the group of experts preparing for the review conference of the Convention on inhumane weapons. In our view, the best forum for deciding on specific measures relating to land-mine use would be that review conference. Measures suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19 could be among those considered by the conference. We look forward to the convening of the conference in

September next year, and are hopeful that its deliberations will result in providing civilians with effective protection against the indiscriminate use of land-mines.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I should like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

My delegation attaches great importance to this draft resolution and fully shares its main thrust and objective, as made evident by the position we have adopted today. Brazil considers that the indiscriminate and irresponsible proliferation of anti-personnel land-mines has to be stopped.

We have not exported these weapons for over three years. We would have liked to be able to become one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, but, unfortunately, the maintenance of the present drafting of operative paragraph 6 did not allow for that. We believe that land-mines can be a legitimate defensive weapon, and they are not yet replaceable. We believe, therefore, that the last part of operative paragraph 6 is a premature and inaccurate political statement.

Mr. Leshem-Stein (Israel): I wish to explain the position of Israel on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Israel joined the consensus because it believes that the international community should seriously address the problem of land-mines, which cause so many tragedies for the civilian population. On 15 July this year, Israel adopted a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines. During this period, Israel will be working with other interested parties to review the establishment of the permanent regime for banning the transfer of anti-personnel mines. In addition to the two-year moratorium, Israel offers its know-how, assistance and training in de-mining.

Israel hopes that these steps, which are humanitarian in nature, will also serve as a global confidence-building measure and will encourage other countries, especially from our region, to follow suit.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would like to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons", as well on A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines".

My delegation sympathizes with the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1. However, we found some of its elements inconsistent with its title. In other words, this draft resolution has gone beyond addressing the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons, in particular in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs.

In that light, acceptance of this draft resolution by my delegation should not be construed as approval of those elements that are outside the scope of the draft.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines", we share some of the concerns expressed by previous speakers with respect to the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6. We also think that the international situation is ripe to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines, and we join the consensus on this draft. Again, our acceptance of the consensus should not be construed as full acceptance of the sixth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate effects". We did not have an opportunity to make that known at the appropriate time, but we would like to express our firm support for it and to thank the other sponsors for their valuable initiative.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to cluster 4: regional disarmament and security.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4.

Ms. Hasan (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of its co-sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.42.

At the present time, the major threats to international peace and security emanate from disputes and arms buildups at the regional levels. Many of the factors that drive regional arms races are specific to each region or subregion. To expect the realization of the goal of regional disarmament through the adoption of global approaches alone is unrealistic. Global measures that lead to a more benign international environment have a positive effect on containing regional arms buildups. These measures are therefore necessary, but by themselves are not sufficient for promoting regional disarmament.

This fact was recognized by the Tenth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Jakarta in 1992, which commended the regional approach in the following words:

> "The Heads of State or Government recognized that security problems which are region-specific and are best addressed within an appropriate regional context. Global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and should be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security." *(A/47/675, annex, chap. II, para. 42)*

That position was reaffirmed by the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement who met recently in Cairo.

We remain convinced that efforts to achieve regional disarmament must be pursued in tandem with global approaches to disarmament. Initiatives to promote regional disarmament cannot be put on hold on the specious pretext that only global approaches can ensure meaningful disarmament. The peoples of regions that are burdened with increasing armaments cannot be told that they can have no relief until the distant Utopia of global disarmament is achieved.

It is with the objective of encouraging regional approaches to disarmament that the co-sponsors put forward the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.42. We hope that the draft resolution will again be given the overwhelming support it has traditionally enjoyed in the First Committee.

I also have the honour of introducing, on behalf of Haiti, Swaziland and Pakistan, the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/49/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

The draft resolution addresses the issue of the threat to international peace and security posed by conventional arms buildups in various regions of the world. Arms buildups in regions of tension aggravate existing conditions and increase the chances of outright conflict. It is therefore necessary that measures be taken to control conventional arms buildups at the regional and subregional levels.

Until now the major effort has been directed not at controlling conventional arms, but towards instituting confidence-building measures, particularly in the area of expenditures and transfers of conventional arms. While these measures can be useful, they must be complemented by steps to actually control conventional arms at the regional and subregional levels.

Substantive and meaningful conventional arms control measures have not been undertaken in regions other than Europe. To institute such measures it would be helpful if the regional parties concerned had before them basic principles that would serve as a framework for negotiations on this issue. Last year the sponsors introduced a similar draft resolution in order to initiate the process of evolving in the Conference on Disarmament, widely accepted principles on the basis of which conventional arms control talks could be held.

During the past year the Conference on Disarmament was preoccupied with various other major issues. We have used this period to hold informal discussions with several interested parties on this matter. On the basis of these discussions a paper on the possible principles that can serve as a framework for negotiations on conventional arms control will be circulated in the next session of the Conference on Disarmament. The views of Member States on the contents of the paper and the ensuing discussions would, hopefully, lead to the formulation of a set of principles that can serve as a guide for parties seeking to control conventional arms at the regional and subregional levels.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 is substantively the same as resolution 48/75 J, which enjoyed the broad support of the Committee last year. We hope that this year, again, the Committee will extend the widest support to this draft.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. Chandra (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/49/L.43 and L.42.

Draft resolution L.43 is seriously flawed, as it does not take into account the ideas enshrined in the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security which was developed after detailed and extensive debate last year by the Disarmament Commission and which, *inter alia*, stipulated:

First, regional arrangements for disarmaments and arms limitation should be agreed freely between all participating States on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality of all the States concerned and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region.

Secondly, States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements between them apply.

Thirdly, regional arrangements should take into account the need to address broader non-military factors which affect security.

Fourthly, regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address, in all its aspects, the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

Not only do these ideas find no specific mention in the draft resolution, but, indeed, the latter conceptually runs counter to them by failing to approach the issue holistically in a broader political — military framework and by seeking to address it on a narrow one-dimensional plane, on which it cannot succeed.

In contending, moreover, that States with larger military capabilities or militarily significant States have a special responsibility in promoting such agreements, it ignores the fact that such States often have wider security problems and concerns, and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

My delegation also cannot accept the primacy of place in the disarmament agenda which the draft resolution appears to give to conventional arms control. We believe that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction cause the most serious threat to international peace and security, and our endeavours should therefore largely be focused on efforts to contain this threat.

The call in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution to the Conference on Disarmament to formulate principles to be applied to regional arms control negotiations is therefore unfortunate, particularly at a time when it is fully stretched in comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations and, possibly, negotiations which could begin on cut-off in production of fissile material for weapons purposes or other nuclear explosive devices.

Above all, given the fact that regional arrangements are region-specific, the Conference on Disarmament exercise on this issue would be futile and a repetition of the excellent work already done in this regard by the Disarmament Commission.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42, while making a reference to the 1993 Disarmament Commission consensus report on regional approaches to disarmament, largely ignores its guidelines and recommendations on the subject. For instance, while the Disarmament Commission guidelines recognize that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security at the lowest possible level of armaments, and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focuses on the security of smaller States and contends that the enhancement thereof would reduce the risk of regional conflicts.

We feel that it is more realistic to recognize, as did the Disarmament Commission, that the security concerns of all States — large and small — must be equally met in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts. The draft resolution furthermore seeks to address nuclear non-proliferation, not only at the regional level, but also on a subregional basis. The Disarmament Commission in its wisdom, did not go that far in contemplating dealing with nuclear non-proliferation on a subregional basis.

As we indicated earlier, and as is well-known, we are of the view that nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is a global issue, which can only be dealt with effectively globally.

It is against this backdrop that we are constrained to abstain on both these draft resolutions and to call for a recorded vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 19th meeting of the Committee on 14 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa

Rica, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Republic of Moldova, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Turkmenistan.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Nigeria

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 19th meeting today, 14 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Haiti, Pakistan and Swaziland.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Singapore

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to briefly explain its position on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/49/L.42 and A/C.1/49/L.43.

Last year the Cuban delegation went along with the consensus on the text adopted, which later became resolution 48/75 G, entitled "Regional disarmament". It was closely linked to guidelines and recommendations on the regional approach to disarmament that had been negotiated seriously and at length within the framework of the Disarmament Commission. In our delegation's view, that text reflected quite adequately the interests of all delegations in the field of regional disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 deals with the same issues of regional disarmament. However, in my delegation's view, it lacks certain ideas that we feel are of special importance, such as the question of the initiative and participation of all States of a given region in negotiating and adopting regional disarmament measures. None the less, we voted in favour of the draft resolution, because we believe it contains some useful elements.

In our opinion, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 singles out for disproportionate treatment some specific aspects of the issue of regional approaches to disarmament. In some passages there are ideas that our delegation cannot support, since they differ from what was negotiated in the Disarmament Commission. In the preambular part, as in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42, the question of the initiative and participation of all the countries of the region has been left out. Also forgotten is the key consideration of the legitimate self-defence needs of States.

In addition, in establishing that conventional arms control should be carried out primarily at the regional and subregional levels, there is no mention of the need for global control of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction or of the influence of and relationship with the global process of controlling conventional weapons.

Finally, with regard to the operative part, we feel that the Conference on Disarmament has before it important negotiations, such as the discussion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The negotiating body should not take on tasks that distract it from its highest priorities.

For those reasons, our delegation was compelled to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

The Chairman: We shall now turn to cluster 5, "Confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments".

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5 before the voting.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures", I would like to ask you, Sir, to postpone action on that draft resolution, as consultations are still going on.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation emphasizes its full support for the international trend to build an international community that does not use force or the threat of the use of force, and in which the principles of justice, equality and peace prevail. We reiterate our readiness and willingness to participate in any international effort seeking in good faith to achieve this objective.

We should like to point out that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments", does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict continues, because Israel is still occupying Arab territories and has refused to implement relevant Security Council resolutions. Moreover, Israel possesses the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction and is capable of producing and stockpiling all kinds of sophisticated weapons. Thus, transparency with regard to Israeli armaments can be established, in respect of the tip of the iceberg.

The Chairman: I remind the Committee that we are considering the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1. Action on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.18 and A/C.1/49/L.21 has been postponed.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) *(interpretation from Spanish):* My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1. However, as we should like to make some additional comments on it, we request that action on it be postponed.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I support the request that has just been made by the representative of Cuba.

The Chairman: In that case, action on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.18, A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.21 is postponed.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, which is entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 3 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): I should like to explain my delegation's position in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1. Had the draft resolution been put to the vote my delegation would have abstained. Egypt continues to believe that transparency of military expenditures and the reporting mechanisms associated with this effort remain ineffective as a disarmament measure. We are rather disappointed that the issues of objective information on military matters and transparency of military expenditures have been merged at this session. Such a link will only detract from the value of the guidelines adopted by the Disarmament Commission on objective information, and we hope that this situation will be remedied in the future.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): I would like to explain briefly the position of the delegation of Pakistan on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, on transparency of military expenditures. Pakistan continues to support the ultimate objective of the draft resolution. Greater transparency in regard to military expenditures would contribute to removing suspicions between States. The lessening of suspicions would also contribute to an eventual decrease in the military expenditures of States. Up to this point we agree with the logic of the draft resolution and therefore joined the consensus on it.

Our reservations pertain to two aspects of the draft resolution. First, it tends to give the impression that greater transparency is a panacea for lessening tensions and promoting peace. Transparency cannot by itself lead to a reduction of military expenditures. It needs to be realized and explicitly stated that transparency is just one of the conditions that can contribute to decreased military spending. The essential prerequisite for achieving this objective is to remove the basic causes of disputes between States. Without movement on that track, measures to promote transparency will merely assume a cosmetic character and will not result in any significant decrease in military expenditures.

Our second reservation relates to the specific methodology by which military expenditures are to be reduced. Reductions in military budgets by specified percentages, which have frequently been advocated by some States, might create a power equation that is more disadvantageous to some countries than to others. It would not eliminate existing disparities. To maintain an equilibrium, it would be equitable to link the reduction of expenditures with force reductions, expressed in physical terms, and to provide for the number of men and machines to be reduced. This seems to be the approach followed by the mutual force reduction talks held in Vienna, and the talks on conventional forces in Europe. A similar approach was also outlined in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament, and there is a need to initiate ways and means to implement that decision.

The success of efforts to bring about meaningful reductions will depend ultimately on the extent to which existing tensions are reduced and security in different regions is enhanced. Peaceful co-existence has yet to emerge as a universal phenomenon. Primary attention should be paid to achieving this.

The Chairman: We will now move to cluster 6, "Outer space disarmament aspects".

I call on delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): My delegation wishes to explain how it will vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". We will abstain for several reasons. The most important deficiency is the language in operative paragraph 8, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to prepare for negotiations to conclude an agreement to prevent an arms race in outer space. This request is one to which the United States cannot subscribe.

In truth, there is no arms race in outer space today. The absence of the alleged arms race in outer space can be attributed to the legal agreements on space already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Thus, the negotiation of any future agreements is not required.

This draft resolution also fails to take into account the reality that there have been historic changes in the global security environment, particularly in relations between the United States and Russia. Because of these changes, and since there is no arms race in outer space, as alleged, there is no foundation for the claim contained in the seventh preambular paragraph that the so-called arms race in outer space represents a

"grave danger for international peace and security".

In addition, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 contains many other elements that simply run counter to the views and policies of the United States. While we have no objection to reviewing issues related to outer space arms control, we do not agree with the fourteenth preambular paragraph or with operative paragraph 8 regarding negotiations on measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. Nor do we agree with the eighteenth preambular paragraph that the fundamental task of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate such an agreement.

Finally, my delegation is disappointed that the current text of operative paragraph 10 continues to contain outmoded language which we had previously identified as inaccurate. This paragraph should be deleted. It no longer corresponds to reality.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation fully supports the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/49/L.15 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We share the view that the Conference on Disarmament has a leading role to play in multilateral efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space. In our view, the most promising sphere for the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament is the preparation of a comprehensive set of confidence-building measures and the guarantee of transparency and predictability for States in their activities in outer space. In that field, the Ad Hoc Committee has a great deal of work to do, which has been initiated by various countries.

However, I should state that the draft resolution as submitted at this session does not fully reflect the realities of the world today. We do not consider it is timely to make an urgent appeal to the Russian Federation and the United States of America to resume the bilateral talks on the prevention of an arms race in outer space which were held between the former Soviet Union and the United States within the context of the preparation of START I. This appeal is contained in operative paragraph 10, on which the delegation of Russia will abstain in a separate vote.

The Chairman: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.15, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 15th meeting of the Committee on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the eighteenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The eighteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 98 votes to 1, with 41 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 8 was retained by 97 votes to 1, with 40 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Omar, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 10 was retained by 87 votes to 1, with 51 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:
Marshall Islands, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I pointed out at the beginning of this meeting, we have made progress in considering clusters 2 to 6. In this regard, the Committee's work has been very effective. Therefore, and as many delegations wish to consult on several draft resolutions, I intend to cancel this afternoon's meeting in order to allow them to carry out the necessary consultations.

Tomorrow morning, if the Committee agrees, we will consider cluster 7 in chronological order, including the draft resolutions whose consideration was left pending this morning.

Ms. Duncan (New Zealand): With regard to your announcement, Sir, the supporters of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7, regarding the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, will be submitting to the Secretariat some revisions to the text. There will be a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7 available tomorrow morning, and it may be necessary to defer consideration of this issue in order to allow delegations enough time to consider the revisions.

The Chairman: The Committee will take note of that statement in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.7.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

United Nations
A/C.1/49/PV.20

General Assembly
Forty-ninth
First Committee
20th Meeting
Tuesday, 15 November 1994, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Agenda items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: As I informed delegations at our meeting yesterday, my intention this morning was to proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions in cluster 7, that is, A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, L.7/Rev.1 and L.26. However, some delegations have asked for a postponement of decisions on those three draft resolutions. Therefore, action on cluster 7 as a whole will be postponed.

The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 8, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.4, L.8, L.12, draft decision L.24 and draft resolutions L.29, L.32, L.35 and L.37.

The Committee will then take up draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46 in cluster 10, entitled "Maintenance of international security," along with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.1, which was submitted to the Committee after the circulation of the Chairman's suggested programme.

Furthermore, I should like to inform you that it is my intention, if time permits, to take a decision on the remaining draft resolutions contained in clusters 3 and 5, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.27, L.18, L.20/Rev.1 and L.21; members will recall that decisions on the latter three draft resolutions had been postponed.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the First Committee): The following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, Israel and Ukraine; A/C.1/49/L.39, Panama; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, Armenia, the Czech Republic, Ireland and Portugal; A/C.1/49/L.8, Nepal; A/C.1/49/L.26, Japan and Swaziland; A/C.1/49/L.22, Lithuania, Mauritius, Portugal and Ukraine; A/C.1/49/L.21, Lithuania and Malta; A/C.1/49/L.12, Brazil; and A/C.1/49/L.27, Malta.

The Chairman: I now call upon delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions and draft decisions.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46, which relates to agenda item 70 and is entitled "Maintenance of international security".

As members will have noted, draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46 is a brief and purely procedural one whereby the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its fiftieth session an item entitled "Maintenance of international security". In our view, this decision would help harmonize the positions of States on questions of international security. The sponsors hope that the draft decision will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Whanndu (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section. [illegible] C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated [illegible]

States, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2 on the establishment of an African nuclear-weapon-free zone. Canada and San Marino have joined in sponsoring this draft resolution.

As members know, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa was adopted at the historic Cairo summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held in 1964. Recent developments in Africa and elsewhere have made it possible, with the support of the international community, to begin the effective implementation of the Declaration. The Group of Experts to Draw up a Draft Treaty on the Denuclearization of Africa, set up jointly by the United Nations and the OAU, has as a result been able to carry out its task.

The African States sincerely thank the Members of the United Nations for their financial and material support in drafting this major treaty. Those States have asked me to convey their appreciation to the Secretary-General and, through him, to his able associates for the diligence with which they have helped the OAU organize the meeting of the Group of Experts.

At the request of the African leaders, as stated at their recent Tunis summit, the Group of Experts is to meet once more to put the finishing technical touches to the draft treaty, which will be submitted to them for their approval and adoption. This is why we have before us the present draft resolution, which lays the groundwork for finalizing the text of the draft treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.

The draft resolution is a procedural one, no different to last year's resolution on the subject. By paragraph 8, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take appropriate action to enable the Group of Experts to meet early in 1995 in order to finalize the drafting of a treaty.

The African States know they can continue to rely on the support of the States Members of the United Nations in getting their plan for effective, concerted action to establish an African nuclear-weapon-free zone down on paper and implemented.

The sponsors hope that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.2 will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Mpay (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Following consultations with a number of delegations, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1 wish to make the following revision. Paragraph 6 should have the following phrase inserted between the words "States Members" and "to participate": "of the Economic Community of Central African States".

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements, in explanation of vote before the voting, on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): On draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade", the United States delegation will vote "no" for the following reasons.

Firstly, the review is unnecessary. The Declaration itself called for the international community to make progress in the 1990s by pursuing disarmament in a number of areas. Progress has been achieved in many of these areas, and discussion of other topics continues at the Conference on Disarmament and in other forums. Anyone interested in reviewing progress made since 1990 can read the public record, in the form of United Nations documents and bilateral and multilateral treaties. Also, the First Committee itself annually reviews progress in this area.

Secondly, in an environment of United Nations budgetary restraint, it would be a waste of valuable time and resources to create an unnecessary and duplicative review process.

Finally, the United States objects to the draft resolution's attempt to place this subject on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. That agenda will be determined by the Disarmament Commission's organizational meeting next month, and should not be prescribed by a First Committee resolution.

Mr. Chandra (India): I should like to explain our vote, before the voting, on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

We had hoped that we could have had one resolution on this subject. Regrettably, this has not been possible, as draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 does not recognize the dual aspect of science and technology — their "Jekyll and Hyde" nature: it focuses exclusively on the beneficial effects of science and technology, and ignores their harmful effects. Moreover, it has taken some paragraphs, selectively, from the unfinished report of the Disarmament

Commission, without the balanced paragraphs. We therefore feel that it is an unbalanced resolution. In addition, it contains laudatory references to norms and guidelines for the transfer of high technology. These are euphemisms for ad hoc control regimes, which are unacceptable to us.

For all these reasons, we will be constrained to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, and we request a recorded vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994, and it is sponsored by Nigeria and Benin.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Marshall Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4 was adopted by 111 votes to 4, with 27 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Ukraine and Venezuela.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote decision on draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24, entitled "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by Mexico.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.24 was adopted by 98 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: We will now proceed to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.29. I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation requests that separate votes be taken on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to vote in accordance with the request of the representative of Iran.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 13th meeting of the

Committee, on 4 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, South Africa, Sweden and Uruguay.

The Chairman: We shall now vote on draft resolution AC/1.49/L.29.

A separate recorded vote has been requested on the preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Mexico, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 132 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, Israel, Mexico, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was retained by 129 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the draft resolution's operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, France, Israel, Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Paragraph 3 of the draft resolution was retained by 128 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Brazil informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, as a whole, was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Nigeria and Sri Lanka.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32 was adopted by 92 votes to 4, with 46 abstentions.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and Haiti.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35 was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, entitled "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 was adopted by 107 votes to 3, with 34 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Germany, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): As a point of order, I should like to ask when delegations will have an opportunity to make explanations of vote on draft resolutions in cluster 8, on which we have just taken action.

The Chairman: I call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I should like, on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, to provide an explanation of our votes on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

Australia and New Zealand regret that they were unable to support this year's draft resolution on this matter, although both countries supported the corresponding draft resolutions in previous years. We were obliged to abstain on this occasion in view of the fact that this year's text runs counter to the constructive, forward-looking approach evident in the related resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, which seeks to promote a solution of the issues raised under this topic by building on the common ground identified in the Disarmament Commission. Australia and New Zealand continue to hope that the two draft resolutions dealing with science and technology can be merged at next year's session of the Committee.

I wish also to make an explanation of vote on resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace".

My delegation voted in favour of this resolution in recognition of the fact that, at this year's session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, in which my delegation participated actively, the Committee was able to overcome some of the political divergences that have beset it in the past and to agree on a report that offers scope for constructive future action. At the same time, we are concerned that the Ad Hoc Committee's credibility will be jeopardized unless it is able to move quickly towards more substantive and focused outcomes that take account of and are relevant to the emerging currents of practical, cooperative measures in and within the Indian Ocean region.

My delegation notes that the wording of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 differs from that of paragraph 18 of the conclusions and recommendations section of the Ad Hoc Committee's 1994 report, from which operative paragraph 5 is otherwise drawn. It is our view that the language of the report is a more accurate reflection of the agreed outcome of this year's Ad Hoc Committee session.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): The United States voted against decision A/C.1/49/L.24, "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects".

Last year my delegation voted against resolution 48/75 C, upon which this decision is based. We voted "No" because we believed that the resolution was not an appropriate or effective vehicle for advancing non-proliferation objectives. Nor did we support the request for a report from the Secretary-General. It was not clear to us what the report was intended to address, what its purpose was or how such a report could further existing efforts. These questions remain unanswered to this day. Consequently, the United States does not support keeping this item on the agenda.

My delegation would like also to explain its abstention in the vote on resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 concerning the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

At its session last spring, the Disarmament Commission concluded its consideration of this subject without reaching agreement on guidelines and recommendations. The Commission reported this result to the General Assembly. Much of resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 represents a selective assortment of elements from a Disarmament Commission conference-room paper that was not agreed and, consequently, has no standing. A number of those elements were, in effect, couched in compromise language that my Government and numerous other Governments were prepared to accept in an effort to achieve consensus in the Disarmament Commission. Since, regrettably, consensus was not achieved, the compromise language can in no way be regarded as agreed.

In addition, resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 makes no reference to existing non-proliferation treaties and arrangements, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the biological weapons Convention. Those treaties and other arrangements have been effective in curbing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As was emphasized in the Disarmament Commission by the United States and many other countries, including most of the sponsors of the resolution, those regimes deserve the recognition and support of the international community. The United States cannot accept the absence from this resolution of any acknowledgement even of their existence.

For these reasons, the United States believes that resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 cannot contribute to a productive multilateral dialogue on the important issues that it covers.

Before concluding, I must make a more general point. The United States hopes that all members of the Committee realize that the introduction for action by this voting body of what could not command consensus in the Disarmament Commission puts into question the Commission's credibility and viability.

Once again, the United States did not participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on this matter.

The United States requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States did not participate in the consideration of or in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.35 on the relationship between disarmament and development.

At the same time, my delegation takes this opportunity to state again that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the final document of the International Conference.

Finally, the United States voted against resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, which concerns the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. My delegation requests your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make an explanation of vote in respect of this draft resolution at a later time.

Mr. Deimundo Escobal (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the resolution we have just adopted in this Committee, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields" (A/C.1/49/L.29).

We express our satisfaction at the efforts being made in this Committee to maintain a constructive dialogue on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields. My country attaches great importance to science and technology, not only as a source of social well-being and economic development, but also as a significant contribution to the full validity and implementation of arms-control agreements and disarmament in areas such as elimination of weapons, the conversion of military industry for civilian purposes and verification. At the same time, Argentina wishes especially to emphasize that all States must use technology responsibly, and supports the establishment of national and international controls to prevent technology from being diverted to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons to qualitative improvements in them, and to destabilizing effects that threaten international peace and security.

In this respect, in order to avoid having transfers of science and technology with military applications banned, we think it is essential to ensure that such transfers be carried out responsibly under strict controls that will ensure that such science and technology is used for purely peaceful purposes. For this reason, my delegation is committed to the idea of non-proliferation and promotes the development of any non-proliferation regimes and arrangements, whether they be regional or subregional, multilateral or bilateral.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.24. Last year we voted against what became resolution 48/75 C, which is referred to in the draft resolution. We take the view that, as has been demonstrated in practice, the consideration of the problem of non-proliferation in such a context does not serve the purposes of strengthening the non-proliferation regime relating to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. On the contrary, it weakens it. As a result, we do not think it rational that the provisional agenda of the next session of the General Assembly should include this item.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I wish to explain the position of my delegation in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

This draft resolution is closely related to the one we have traditionally sponsored with other delegations, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", but in the past they were always kept to different dimensions of the same issue. This year we were not able to support draft resolution L.32, because of its last preambular paragraph, which includes language that is part of the main efforts towards which draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29 was directed. We do not believe that we can deal with the question of access to technology exclusively with legal treaties; we also need, as is well stated in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution L.29,

"universally acceptable norms and guidelines".

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): I would like to explain the vote of the German delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.4, entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade".

Germany was able to vote in favour of this draft resolution, in view of its general support for the idea of reviewing the Declaration of the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade. This, however, was done on the understanding that the operative paragraphs of draft resolution L.4 are not intended to predetermine the possible results of the usual procedure of deciding on agenda items for the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): I speak on behalf of the delegation of France as well as that of the United Kingdom in order to explain our abstentions on the draft resolution that the Committee has adopted, the text of which is contained in document A/C.1/49/L.29, on "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

Our two delegations continue to believe that the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament is a subject of great significance to the international community, where the broad cooperation of all States Members of the United Nations is necessary in order to achieve the desired goals. In this respect, we note with regret that, despite the considerable effort that has been devoted to the subject in the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly in years past, the international community has not been able to agree on guidelines for the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

The discussions at the Disarmament Commission in 1994 were difficult, but we were close to achieving consensus. Unfortunately, the refusal of a small number of delegations to recognize existing legal commitments undertaken under relevant multilateral treaties and international agreements, as well as the misguided belief that qualitative improvements in weapons technology could be only detrimental to global security, led to a breakdown of the consensus and the failure of the Commission's work on this item.

Draft resolution L.29 draws selectively from some of the paragraphs discussed by the Disarmament Commission earlier this year. We recognize the attempt to find compromise language, but we regret that the text of the resolution does not reflect the existence of the large body of international treaties, legal instruments, agreements and international legislative measures which all seek to contribute to the enhancement of the role of science and technology in the context of international security. We should like to point in particular to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the biological and toxin weapons Convention and the chemical weapons Convention, all of which address the issue of the transfer of high technology related to weapons of mass destruction. It is inconceivable to our delegations that any conclusions on the role of science and technology in this field could ignore these fundamental pillars of non-proliferation.

Similarly, we believe that it is the responsibility of all States to support these international instruments by adopting and implementing national export-control measures.

The United Kingdom and France are disappointed that the text omitted such references, since we were prepared to consider the possibilities offered by this draft resolution if it could have secured an acceptable compromise leading to consensus. It was our hope that we could move further towards consensus this year. To permit this, however, the text needed to recognize the importance of adherence to existing legal commitments and their implementation. Because it failed to do so, France and the United Kingdom concluded reluctantly that their positions could be reflected accurately only by an abstention.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.29, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields".

My delegation did not participate in the vote on the similar draft resolution last year. We hoped that the sponsors would consider our views and the views of some other delegations this year. Unfortunately, that was not the case, despite the fact that my delegation provided the sponsors with some alternative paragraphs.

We believe that an important issue that has not been resolved in the Disarmament Commission in the course of four years' intensive negotiations cannot be resolved in a single General Assembly resolution. We fully associate ourselves with the views expressed by the representative of India on these draft resolutions, and I do not intend to go into the details; however, we are of the view that in the field of the transfer of science and technology for peaceful purposes, the international community should adopt a forward-looking approach.

The existing legal treaties do not adequately ensure the transfer of science and technology for peaceful purposes. Even their modest provisions are subject to contradictory interpretations. Therefore, we strongly believe that the General Assembly initiative on the adoption of norms and guidelines for the transfer of science and technology — I refer to the seventh preambular paragraph — or the adoption of national measures, which in our view are actually export-control measures, should have included the suggestion that Member States should review their national measures and ensure their full compatibility with international law regulating the transfer of high technology with military applications, seeking to ensure that such transfers do not undermine international peace and security, that access is not denied to high technology product services and know-how for peaceful purposes and that all existing restrictions against the States parties are removed through multilaterally negotiated disarmament treaties.

We also believe that the General Assembly should have expressed the view that cooperation in this field between supplier and recipient States must be promoted on the basis of commitments embodied in multilaterally negotiated agreements, to prevent transfers of high technology with military applications for peaceful purposes from being diverted to non-peaceful uses, and that such cooperation should be based on clearly defined and balanced rights and obligations, appropriate measures of transparency and verification, equity, fairness and predictability of incentives and so on.

We also abstained on the draft resolution as a whole, for the reasons that I have just explained and because the sponsors have attempted to compile non-consensus elements of a Disarmament Commission document.

Finally, we hope that the sponsors of these draft resolutions will continue their negotiations with interested delegations, in order to bring positions closer and have a consensus draft resolution on this issue, perhaps in coming years.

Mr. Kunda (Zambia): My delegation was not present when action was taken on a number of draft resolutions and the draft decision in cluster 8, under the rubric of "Other disarmament measures". I wish to put on record that, had we been present, we would have voted in favour and joined the consensus where applicable.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to cluster 10, draft resolutions on international security. We have received a request to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.1. The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/49/L.46.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/49/L.46, entitled "Maintenance of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 15 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: France, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

I hear no objection; I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.46 was adopted.

We now return to cluster 5 and the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, as orally amended by the representative of Cameroon in today's meeting.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The revised draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, which was orally amended by the representative of Cameroon, was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the Committee's 14th meeting, on 7 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Kenya, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, and Zaire.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I hear no objection; I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): This afternoon's meeting will be cancelled, to permit representation to continue the process of consultations and negotiations on the draft resolutions that are still outstanding. I request that this process of consultation and negotiation be speeded up as far as possible so that the Committee may take the necessary action as early as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

United Nations

A/C.1/49/PV.21

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

21st Meeting

Wednesday, 16 November 1994, 3.30 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Accession of Ukraine to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have the honour to inform the Committee that today Ukraine has become the 167th State Party to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The Parliament of Ukraine today passed a law on Ukraine's adherence to the Treaty. The result of the vote was more than convincing: 301 deputies voted in favour, 8 voted against and 13 abstained. The decision bears witness to the fact that the Parliament, the President and the Government of Ukraine have always been consistent and principled in their approach to nuclear weapons, particularly with respect to adherence to the NPT. Ukraine has proceeded gradually and with great difficulty, but purposefully, towards this decision.

In July 1990 the Supreme Soviet, in its Declaration of Ukraine's sovereignty, solemnly proclaimed its intention to support the three non-nuclear principles. The Parliament subsequently adopted a number of documents that confirmed Ukraine's intention to adhere to the NPT as a non-nuclear Power. An important step has been with Ukraine's adherence to the NPT.

I would like to take a few minutes now to say something about the path travelled by Ukraine in adopting this law on adhering to the NPT. This decision was not a simple matter. I would like to emphasize the special situation in which Ukraine found itself after the disintegration of the former Soviet Union; the essence of that situation was that under the NPT Ukraine was neither a nuclear nor a non-nuclear State. Ukraine inherited the nuclear weapons that had been deployed on its territory. It possessed those nuclear weapons, but, because control of those nuclear weapons was never granted to Ukraine, it could not be considered a nuclear State purely and simply. I must say that the provisions of articles I and II of the Treaty do not take full account of the unique situation in which Ukraine found itself at that time. This contradiction was eliminated by the Ukrainian Parliament's adoption of the decision to adhere to the NPT.

As to giving guarantees for our national security, after the signing of the well-known three-party statement on 14 January this year and the most recent consultations in the Parliament, the executive power in Ukraine took additional energetic measures to bring about an acceptable final agreement on those guarantees, with a view to acceding to the NPT. A great number of formal and informal meetings were held, including negotiations in the capitals of some nuclear States, as well as exchanges of letters. During these discussions and talks the interests of our government were pursued, especially with respect to getting guarantees for our national security. There is now reason to say that this question has really been settled. States such as Russia, the United States, France and the United Kingdom are prepared to cooperate with Ukraine in providing guarantees for its national security, and I think that in the near future we shall witness an important event connected with the signing of an instrument that will make it possible for Ukraine to have these guarantees. On the eve of the NPT Conference to take place in April 1995, that fact is of exceptional importance. Equally important will be the adoption of the corresponding decision at the Conference, especially

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

concerning the providing of guarantees by nuclear States of the national security of non-nuclear States.

I would also like to say that the adherence of Ukraine to the NPT confirms the reputation of our State as a reliable international partner, which is borne out by what it is doing in nuclear disarmament and in strengthening global security and stability. This step may promote the development of widespread cooperation between Ukraine, other States and relevant international organizations in the peaceful use of atomic energy, outer space and sophisticated technology, to develop the full potential of cooperation between structures that today have been established in that area. Ukraine counts on support by other States in its aspirations to make its own contribution to the common work in this field. The decision of the Parliament of Ukraine to adhere to the NPT will have an effect on the future process of disarmament and other processes that are being considered and examined here in this Committee.

The Chairman (*interpretation of Spanish*): I believe that I speak for all members of the Committee in expressing to the Government of Ukraine our congratulations on the important decision they have taken. Member States have taken due note of that decision.

Agenda items 56 to 65, 68, 71, 72 and 73 ***(continued)***

Action on draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: In spite of the fact that the Committee has completed action on a considerable number of draft resolutions submitted under the disarmament and international security agenda items, approximately 27 more draft resolutions remain to be acted upon during the five meetings of the Committee allotted to this phase of its work. To be able to complete the consideration of these items by the scheduled date, Friday, 18 November, the Committee should make every effort to take action on as many draft resolutions as possible at the meetings today and tomorrow.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions. A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1, Australia; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, New Zealand; A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, Andorra; and A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1, Cambodia.

The Chairman: I would like to suggest that th Committee proceed to take a decision first on some of th draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 that I believe ar ready to be acted upon, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.10, A/C.1/49/L.14 an A/C.1/49/L.41. After completing action on those dra resolutions, the Committee will proceed to take a decisio on the remaining draft resolutions contained in clusters 5 7 and 10, which I believe are also ready to be acted upor namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.21 A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 an A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision o the draft resolutions contained in those clusters, I shall ca on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): I wish first of all to convey th heartfelt congratulations of my delegation to the delegatio of Ukraine on having taken the historic step of acceding t the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapon (NPT). Our goal should be to attain the universality of tha Treaty.

It is in the context of the universality of the NPT tha I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1. That revision ha been produced as a result of extensive, broad-base consultations within the First Committee and with al parties concerned. It clearly demonstrates the flexibility an good faith of the sponsors in addressing this importan issue. The current formulation of draft resolutio A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 takes into account the view expressed by many interested delegations. It is a sincer effort to strengthen the NPT in order to attain th universality of that Treaty, which should remain ou objective.

The draft resolution should in the final analysis b regarded as an invitation to join a club as a full-fledge member, with all the rights, all the obligations and all th responsibilities that derive from joining the NPT. Th sponsors believe that all NPT parties have a solemn duty t support all efforts aimed at strengthening the non proliferation regime. On the basis of the consultations w have conducted, it is the understanding of the sponsors tha draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 commands wid support within the Committee, and the sponsors loo forward to the Committee's support.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Like Ambassador Elaraby, I wish to convey my delegation's congratulations to the representative of Ukraine on his country's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). A few weeks ago, my country itself ratified that Treaty, and it will be ready to submit its instrument of ratification in a few weeks.

I wish now to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", on behalf of its sponsors, which include almost all the coastal States of the Mediterranean: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Spain and Tunisia.

The increase in the number of sponsors compared with last year is a perfect illustration of the state of mind in most Mediterranean countries and of their willingness to work together to strengthen cooperation and security in the Mediterranean basin. Those are the principal considerations that prevailed during the formulation of the draft resolution.

This draft resolution differs from previous resolutions on this item in that it deals in a more orderly way with a broader range of questions relating to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, taking greater account of the current situation in our region. Taking advantage of the dynamics of peace that prevail in the region, the sponsors wanted to express their sincere desire to give fresh impetus to their multifaceted relations so as to bolster the climate of confidence and security that is essential if the Mediterranean is to be a lake of peace and cooperation.

The draft resolution we are submitting to the First Committee this year restates most of the paragraphs of earlier resolutions that, in the view of the sponsors, remain timely and omits those no longer of significance. It introduces new provisions aimed more at the attainment of the objectives of this initiative, such as those relating to security and cooperation.

By the preamble, the General Assembly would bear in mind all initiatives taken by the Mediterranean countries with a view to consolidating peace, security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. It would reaffirm the primary role of the riparian countries themselves. The Assembly would note with satisfaction the positive developments in the Middle East peace process that will lead to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. The Assembly would further reaffirm the responsibility of all States to contribute to the stability and prosperity of the Mediterranean region and their commitment to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the provisions of the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Also in the preambular part, the Assembly would also recognize the indivisible character of security in the Mediterranean and the determination of Mediterranean countries to intensify the process of dialogue and consultations with a view to resolving the problems existing in the region, to eliminate the causes of tension, and to foster closer European-Mediterranean cooperation.

The operative part of the draft resolution draws upon the main provisions of last year's resolution 48/81 and strengthens those that encourage riparian States to continue their efforts to remove all obstacles to the promotion of confidence-building measures, disarmament measures and other measures towards the establishment of a climate of peace, security, stability and prosperity in the Mediterranean region.

In the area of disarmament and security, the Assembly would welcome with satisfaction Algeria's adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and would call upon all other States in the region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments related to the field of disarmament. Similarly, the Assembly would encourage all States of the region to promote genuine openness and transparency in all military matters.

Further, the Assembly would recognize that the elimination of the economic and social disparities in levels of development will contribute to enhancing peace, security and cooperation among Mediterranean countries. It would encourage Mediterranean countries to strengthen further their cooperation in facing terrorist activities, which pose a threat to peace, security and stability in the region. It would invite all States of the region to address the challenge of terrorism through cooperation of all kinds, and to address criminal acts, as well as illegal drug production, consumption and trafficking, which jeopardize the friendly relations among States, hinder the development of international cooperation and result in the destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the democratic basis of pluralistic society.

Furthermore, the Assembly would encourage the continued widespread support among Mediterranean countries for the convening of a conference on security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, as well as the ongoing regional consultations to create the appropriate conditions for its convening.

In view of this new dynamic motivating most of the coastal States of the Mediterranean region, which is faithfully reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, the sponsors remain confident that, as in previous sessions, this draft resolution will enjoy the support of all members of the Committee and will thus be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Mexico endorses the comments that you addressed a few moments ago to the delegation of Ukraine.

I have asked to speak to propose an oral amendment to draft resolution, on the consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The delegation of Mexico has already had the honour to present this draft resolution on behalf of the co-sponsors. Since we did so, however, there has been a development that should be reflected in the text. On 9 November, the Government of Belize deposited in Mexico its instrument of ratification of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which means that 29 States in the region are now full parties to the Treaty.

The first amendments are to the seventh preambular paragraph, where "Argentina" will now be followed by "Belize" and the number "twenty-eight" will be changed to "twenty-nine". Next, in operative paragraph 2 "Belize" is to be inserted between "Argentina" and "Brazil".

The States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco welcome the measures taken on 9 November by the Government of Belize.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): Due note has been taken of the oral amendments proposed by the representative of Mexico to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10.

Ms. Hasan (Pakistan): I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a highly feasible means of controlling nuclear proliferation as well as of creating legal barriers against the threat or use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Such zones can also contribute to promoting mutual trust and confidence among the States of the region and strengthen regional and international peace and security. The consolidation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the progress towards the conclusion of a treaty for an African nuclear-weapon-free zone and the recent moves to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Atlantic vindicate the efficacy of the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In South Asia, the nuclear arms genie was let loose in 1974. There is an urgent need to eliminate this genie before it wreaks untold havoc. This can effectively be done by establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This is an achievable objective. All the countries of the region have made, at the highest levels, unilateral declarations pledging not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons. The next logical step would be to transform those pledges into a multilateral regime that would ensure that the region is freed from the presence of nuclear weapons.

In case any one regional party has apprehensions about the effect of a nuclear-weapon-free zone on its ability to ward off extra-regional threats to its security, these can be addressed by holding multilateral consultations to ensure nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. Proposals for holding such consultations involving regional and concerned extra-regional States already exist.

Also on the table are other proposals which, if pursued, could reduce the incentives to opt for nuclear arms. The mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces would be especially helpful in removing a major factor that leads to nuclear weaponization, and would thereby contribute to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, has been prepared along the same lines as resolution 48/72, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority last year. We hope that the First Committee will again lend broad support to the draft resolution. By doing so, the international community would be encouraging all the States in the region to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

My colleague will now introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41.

Mr. Jilani (Pakistan): I am privileged to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution is co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkmenistan and Viet Nam.

With the end of the cold war, there have been significant moves to decrease the overwhelming importance of nuclear weapons in the security policies of nuclear-weapon States. The commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the initiation of a process of nuclear disarmament by the United States and the Russian Federation, the steps taken by some of the former Soviet Republics in regard to their nuclear arsenals — all these are encouraging examples of efforts to build security structures that are not based on the possession or use of nuclear weapons.

The present developments have led to a propitious climate for bringing about meaningful progress on the issue of providing security assurances to non-nuclear weapon States.

We believe that the time is ripe for substantive progress on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament. This view was also expressed by the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement at their recent conference in Cairo. The Foreign Ministers urged the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate, as a matter of priority, an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

The most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would obviously be their complete elimination. Until that much desired goal is achieved, the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with legally binding assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in order to address their security concerns.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41 reaffirms the urgent need to reach an early agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula that could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The draft resolution is substantively the same as General Assembly resolution 48/73, which was adopted last year by an overwhelming majority, with only a couple of abstentions. We hope that the Committee will again offer the widest support to this draft resolution.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): When the United States voted yesterday against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, entitled "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace", my delegation reserved the right to explain its vote later. We wish to do so now.

The United States warmly commends the sponsors of the draft resolution for their continuing constructive efforts to make positive changes in the text of the draft resolution. We see considerable improvement this year over last year's version.

That having been said, as was the case last year, the United States was obliged to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37. Certain navigational rights and freedoms were inadequately addressed in the text — in particular, references to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and to freedom of the high seas in conformity with the Convention. These did not adequately address full navigational freedoms.

We believe that the freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passages through international straits and archipelagic sea lanes passage should be explicitly acknowledged. The United States encourages the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 to give due weight to these considerations of paramount interest to maritime Powers.

The United States further encourages the sponsors of the draft resolution, and, indeed, all States in the Indian Ocean region, to take practical steps to develop and implement confidence-building measures. We believe that zones of peace can best be created and sustained through careful and successful negotiations of the relevant parties.

We would like to take this opportunity to commend the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for exploring alternative approaches in its work. The informal discussions between the Ad Hoc Committee and the United States and other maritime Powers offer a useful mechanism to address these important issues. We underscore that the United States welcomes such discussion with the Committee.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1: A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.10, with the oral amendments introduced by the representative of Mexico; A/C.1/49/L.14; and A/C.1/49/L.41. After we complete action on these draft resolutions we will take decisions on remaining items in clusters 5, 7 and 10 — that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 and A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

We have been requested to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation intends to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". As we have stated before, achieving a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests by amending the 1963 Treaty is not feasible, because that would not affect the two nuclear Powers that are not parties to the Treaty. Furthermore, such an amendment, by virtue of the provisions of the 1963 Treaty itself, could not be accepted, because all the original parties to the Treaty are not in agreement on this matter.

However, the main consideration today is that the situation has radically changed since January 1994, when the multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament to draft a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests began. In those negotiations, in which all the nuclear States, as well as other concerned States, participated, an enormous amount of work was done which has now made it possible to talk about concluding a treaty. In these circumstances, the continuation of any sort of parallel process moving beyond the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests would distract the world community's attention from the work being done in Geneva and the negotiations under way there, while also creating an unjustified illusion regarding the possibility of alternative negotiations.

We oppose any steps that would create such illusions, and we oppose any plans, if they exist in anyone's mind, to get around the negotiating process taking place in Geneva by putting forward texts that have not resulted from the negotiations. We are convinced that only through the active continuation of efforts under way in the Conference on Disarmament, with the mandatory participation of all nuclear States, will it be possible to attain a truly comprehensive — all-inclusive — prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): Once again the United Kingdom will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". We shall do so because the text does not refer clearly to the essential relationship between the security assurance given by a nuclear-weapon State and the necessity for a binding commitment from recipient States on nuclear non-proliferation, preferably through adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). We believe that establishing this relationship supports the non-proliferation objectives to which the international community is committed. The relationship is spelled out in the United Kingdom's unilateral declaration on security assurances, which is referred to in the draft resolution. We regret that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41 does not reflect this important element. That is why we are unable to support it.

Meanwhile, the United Kingdom has repeatedly stressed its willingness to continue to consider ways and means to achieve effective international arrangements. In recent months we have been working with other nuclear-weapon States to try to agree on a joint text on assurances that might meet the concerns reflected in the present draft resolution. We continue to be engaged in that effort.

Mr. Starr (Australia): On behalf of Canada, New Zealand and Australia, I would like to make a statement before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, on negative security assurances.

Canada, Australia and New Zealand have consistently supported the conclusion of effective international arrangements to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Our delegations have been active in pursuit of this high-priority goal, including in putting forward concrete proposals and ideas. Our delegations have been equally consistent in stressing the necessary linkage between such assurances, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, acceptance by the beneficiary States of unambiguous and internationally verified nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

It is not reasonable, we believe, for any State to expect to benefit from security assurances if it is not itself willing to contribute to assuring the nuclear security of others by subscribing to the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. The overwhelming majority of non-nuclear-weapon States have displayed such commitment by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to regional non-proliferation accords of comparable scope or to both. There is no doubt as to the nuclear reassurance they have extended to others, pursuant to the NPT and other accords. They are demonstrably and verifiably non-nuclear-weapon States. This makes it all the more appropriate that the nuclear-weapon States move decisively in the context of next years's NPT Conference to put in place the matching general and legally binding positive and negative security assurances which are required in our contemporary world.

As in previous years, our delegations have urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to reflect in the text the importance of binding non-nuclear-weapon State non-proliferation commitments. In our view, the continued absence of such references detracts from and significantly undermines the credibility of a text which we would otherwise wish to co-sponsor. We wish to stress clearly the serious light in which we view this conscious omission. Our delegations will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the basis that the overwhelming majority of its supporters in fact share our concerns in this regard.

Our support also reflects the expectation, as we approach the 1995 Conference, that the community of States parties to the NPT will indeed seize the new opportunities available, with a view to extending a package of legally binding security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States which act in full compliance with their own binding multilateral nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

Mr. Chandra (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.14, as well as its vote on other resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones.

It has always been our view that nuclear disarmament is a global issue that can only be resolved globally and addressed through a global approach. The goal of nuclear disarmament, leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, cannot be achieved by partial measures. We do not consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as being in accord with this global approach. The global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the world render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament.

I should say, further, that the United Nations has endorsed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones only after an appropriate definition of the region, based on a correct perception of its geographical extent and taking into account the full range of security concerns of the States of the region. Moreover, such zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and with the consent of the States of the region concerned. This view was fully reflected in the Disarmament Commission's 1993 consensus paper on regional disarmament. In this context, while we see no great merit in resolutions calling for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, we are willing to go along with those that are based on consensus and fulfil the United Nations established criteria that I have cited.

However, we are unable to go along with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, which calls for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it fails to fulfil any of the United Nations endorsed criteria and lacks consensus. We shall therefore vote against the draft resolution, and we call for a recorded vote.

Mr. Florent (France) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

As it did last year, my delegation will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because it contains no link between security assurances given to non-nuclear-weapon States and a commitment by them not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons — a link such as that in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We feel that the absence of any reference to a commitment to non-proliferation, and in particular to the NPT, is especially regrettable now, with the NPT Review and Extension Conference only months away.

Moreover, the text continues to employ language that fails to take into account the way in which the international situation has developed since the end of the cold war; the threats to international security have changed their character, the increased risks of proliferation now being the main threat. France, for its part, considers that the question of security assurances puts at risk the international responsibilities of the nuclear Powers, respect for non-proliferation commitments and defence needs.

With regard to non-proliferation commitments, France feels that only States that have undertaken and respect international, legally binding commitments, such as adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, should benefit from such security assurances. France is prepared to pursue its efforts to arrive at an acceptable solution that takes into account the three elements mentioned earlier. Unfortunately, in view of the lack of progress on this draft, compared with last year, my delegation can only abstain again. However, it continues to hope that future texts will be more balanced, taking into account the necessary non-proliferation commitments.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 3 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Venezuela, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Bahamas, Senegal, Philippines, Thailand and Peru.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 4, with 44 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.10, with the oral amendments submitted by the representative of Mexico.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 3 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Haiti.

As you have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10 was orally amended at today's meeting by the representative of Mexico.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 16 November 1994, and is sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Myanmar, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14 was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 16 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkmenistan and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): First of all, I should like to explain the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". We voted against this draft resolution for the following reasons.

In 1993 the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva took a decision to start negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty (CTBT) in 1994. In January 1994 a negotiating mandate was agreed and the CTBT negotiations commenced. As noted in this year's report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, the Conference's Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban

> "worked intensively during the 1994 session" *(A/49/27, para. 25.*

The Conference on Disarmament has agreed to continue negotiations during next month's intersessional period, and has recommended the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee at the outset of the Conference's 1995 session.

The United States welcomed the Conference's decision to negotiate a CTBT. We are satisfied with the progress in the negotiations so far, although we recognize that there is much more work to do. The United States seeks a comprehensive test ban treaty at the earliest possible time, and we will redouble our efforts when we resume our work in Geneva two weeks from now. Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1 is not helpful to this negotiating process, and it implies a lack of faith in the Conference on Disarmament as a forum for the CTBT negotiations. This is not the way to promote success in achieving the objectives of a successful negotiation on the CTBT.

A limited test ban Treaty Amendment Conference is not a suitable forum for negotiating a CTBT. Moreover, the United States continues to oppose convening another special meeting of the States parties to the limited test ban Treaty in order to

> "review developments and assess the situation regarding a comprehensive test ban and to examine the feasibility of resuming the work of the Amendment Conference". *(A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, para. 2)*

I should also like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

My delegation attaches great importance to the nuclear non-proliferation initiatives in South Asia. In this regard, and with reference to operative paragraph 2, we call on all States in the region to ensure that their policies do not prejudice the objectives of this draft resolution. At the same time, my delegation wishes to note that United States support for the draft resolution should not be interpreted as a blanket endorsement of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as might be inferred from the third preambular paragraph.

Mr. Wiranataatmadja (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to clarify its abstention in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The position of Indonesia concerning this issue is well known. Indonesia, together with other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, continues in its efforts to promote South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Specifically, in paragraphs 33 and 60 of that document, the General Assembly has declared that the establishment of such zones should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. In paragraph 61, the Assembly also stated that the process of establishing them in different parts of the world should be encouraged and that the States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements.

As efforts to achieve agreement on this issue are still to be conclusively pursued, my delegation deemed it essential to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We support the rightful aspirations of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons. We are impressed by the fact that this draft resolution appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement between nuclear-weapon States on a common formula for such guarantees.

Russia's military doctrine, as stated by the President of Russia and confirmed by him on 9 November 1993, contains the following formula for such guarantees:

> "The Russian Federation will not use its nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968, except in cases of (a) armed attack against a State member of an alliance with a nuclear-weapon State, against the Russian Federation, its territory, armed forces and other troops or its allies; and (b) joint action of such a State with a nuclear-weapon State in the implementation of or support of an invasion or armed attack against the Russian Federation, its territory, armed forces and other troops or its allies."

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Israel supported the draft resolution because it believes in the regional approach in arms control. However, Israel also believes that regional disputes should be resolved by the parties concerned in the region through free and mutual negotiations which would lead to agreements accepted by all the parties involved. Any attempt to impose agreements from outside the region — for example, by an international organization — is likely to impede those efforts.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on pending draft resolutions — those contained in documents A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 and A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1 is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Benin, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Jordan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden and Ukraine.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Togo at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gambia — on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States — Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26 was adopted.

The Chairman: we shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2 entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 21st meeting of the Committee on 16 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Spain and Tunisia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: We have finished taking action on those pending draft resolutions. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Rhee (Republic of Korea): I wish to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26, on United Nations regional centres.

My delegation joined in the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. This draft resolution is very important, because the regional centres, my delegation believes, have substantially contributed to the cause of the United Nations disarmament efforts. As one Member State that has assiduously participated in the activities organized by the regional centres, we cannot but commend the centres and their efforts. In this regard, my country substantially increased its financial contributions to the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific at this year's pledging conference. This year my delegation seriously considered becoming a sponsor of this draft resolution. However, operative paragraph six made it difficult for us to do so. Although we fully sympathize with the concerns expressed in the paragraph, my delegation is of the view that it could cause practical difficulties. My delegation sincerely hopes that some middle ground can be found in this regard next year.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States joined in the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission". In this connection, however, I wish to state that the United States does not interpret the language in operative paragraph 10 of that draft resolution to mean that there should be a third agenda item for the 1995 session of the Disarmament Commission. Any decision on its agenda is to be made at the Commission's organizational session. My delegation must make it clear even now, however, that the United States does not support the inclusion of a third agenda item in 1995, and that it will stand by that position during the forthcoming organizational session of the Disarmament Commission. In 1991 the Commission adopted, in principle, a three-item, phased approach to its agenda, but it has applied that approach in a pragmatic manner. Thus, the subject of the role of science and technology was kept on the agenda for four years. The nuclear disarmament item has been in its current formulation on the Commission's agenda since 1991. The United States is of the firm view that at its 1995 session the Commission should concentrate all its efforts on concluding that item and on discussing in greater depth the subject of international arms transfers.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): I wish first to explain the United Kingdom's position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, on the report of the Disarmament Commission.

Although the United Kingdom joined the consensus, we wish to make it clear that we do not regard this draft resolution as in any way binding on the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission — in particular, on its decisions on whether to adopt a new third agenda item for its 1995 session and, if so, on what that item should be. Given the intensive activity on disarmament already scheduled for 1995, particularly the Non-Proliferation Treaty Conference and the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, my delegation believes that in 1995, despite the agreement in principle that there should normally be three items discussed each year, the Commission should limit itself, exceptionally, to the two existing items, with a view to concluding its work on the nuclear disarmament item, which by then will be in its fifth year, and engaging in substantive work on the illicit arms transfers item. We see no merit in devoting scarce time and resources to another item. In any case, neither of the proposals contained in operative paragraph 10 has any great appeal to us.

I would like to go on to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26. We were happy to support that draft resolution, which was adopted, on the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament. We commend the activities being carried out by the regional centres, and we fully support their continued work. But, as we have made clear on previous occasions, it is important that the regional centres should not impose any additional burden on the United Nations regular budget and that any new activities should continue to be funded by voluntary contributions. We assume, in the absence of any statement by the Secretariat, that the adjustments requested in the draft resolution will not impose any new financial burden on the United Nations budget.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. My delegation wishes to remind the Committee that its position is that all regional security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace negotiations. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution does not take this into account. Accordingly, we have to reiterate that our position is that in the region of the Middle East the establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapons-free zone in due course is the suitable solution.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, adopted by consensus, because of the noble causes reflected therein. However, it has a reservation on the wording of the seventh preambular paragraph.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to express my delegation's strong reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the view that the so-called peace process in the Middle East will not lead to full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, nor achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

The Chairman: The Committee has finished its work for this afternoon's meeting. So far we have adopted 27 draft resolutions or decisions, and there are still 20 draft resolutions on which the Committee has to take action.

Delegations may notice that during our current phase there is occasionally a slight delay in starting meetings. This is inevitable, for a number of reasons, of which delegations are well aware, including last-minute consultations and consequent requests by some delegations for a delay. Accordingly, I ask delegations to bear with us on this matter. Members can rest assured that everything possible is being done, and will continue to be done, to start our meetings on time. In that context, I am confident that delegations will be happy to note that, on the basis of statistical data provided by Conference Services on a weekly basis, the First Committee has registered one of the best records in recent years with respect to the fullest possible use of the time and resources allocated to it.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

United Nations
A/C.1/49/PV.22

General Assembly

Forty-ninth Session

Official Records

First Committee

22nd Meeting

Thursday, 17 November 1994, 10.30 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 68 to 73 and 153 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This morning we shall proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in clusters 1, 5 and 7 — namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, L.28, L.31, L.36, L.21, L.7/Rev.1 and L.49/Rev.1.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: Mauritania, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1; Italy and Belgium, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.22/Rev.1; Italy, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1.

The Chairman: I call upon the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", submitted under agenda item 65, "Israeli nuclear armament". This year the sponsors decided to change the traditional title of the draft resolution without giving us adequate reasons.

Despite repeated calls by the General Assembly on Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to put its nuclear-weapons programme under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, there has been no change in Israel's position in this respect. We now see that, despite that refusal, substantive changes have been introduced into the text of the draft resolution, namely, into its title.

I would recall that a majority of the States in the region are parties to the NPT and have safeguards agreements with the IAEA. The only menace in the region comes from Israel's nuclear-weapons programme.

Therefore, my delegation expresses its regret at the new changes introduced into the draft resolution. We express our strong reservations about the title of the draft resolution and paragraph 4. We consider that these changes reward a regional nuclear proliferator that has rejected repeated calls by the General Assembly to accede to the NPT and to place its nuclear-weapons programme under IAEA safeguards.

I also wish to express our strong reservations about the fifth preambular paragraph, which refers to the so-called "Middle East peace process". We believe that the so-called peace process will not lead to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people or to the establishment of a lasting, just and comprehensive peace in the region.

The Chairman: The Committee will have adequate time for explanations of vote or position before action is taken on each of the draft resolutions. For the moment,

94-87100 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

delegations should confine themselves to explaining their votes or positions on texts on which the Committee has already taken action.

Ms. Duncan (New Zealand): I would like to speak in explanation of vote on behalf of New Zealand and Australia, in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, on the Amendment Conference of States Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty. The Committee approved the draft resolution yesterday.

It was with regret that New Zealand and Australia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. We attach the highest priority to the early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Over the years we have worked for progress on nuclear-testing issues, including at the 1991 substantive session of the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference and at subsequent meetings of States parties convened by the President of the Conference, Mr. Alatas, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia.

The focus of the international community has now moved to the Conference on Disarmament, where work is well under way on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1 the General Assembly would note with satisfaction the initiation of these multilateral negotiations. New Zealand and Australia had hoped that this year's draft resolution would take these negotiations as a point of departure and look ahead to the role that the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference might play once a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been concluded and in preparation for its entry into force.

We were therefore disappointed that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1 seemed to contemplate the possibility of substantive work towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty taking place within the process of the Amendment Conference. Our hope remains that future draft resolutions on this subject will merit the same strong support as the text on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, on which the Committee will be taking action before the conclusion of this session. We believe that this would be the most constructive way to encourage the Geneva negotiations and ensure that rapid progress is made there and that a treaty is concluded without delay. That is the goal we all share.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on draft resolutions in the clusters to which I referred earlier, I shall call on delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

(spoke in Spanish)

In that connection, I wish on behalf of the delegations that make up the Bureau of the Committee — Austria, Japan, South Africa and Ecuador — to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1, "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee".

As members know, the Bureau wished from the outset to carry out an experiment, with informal consideration of specific agenda items following the formal general debate, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution 48/87. The purpose of that second phase was to enable delegations, in an informal, cordial and candid atmosphere, but with full conference services, to engage in a dialogue setting out their respective positions, establishing points of contact, and identifying differences requiring additional consultations and negotiations. The Committee's officers felt that this first trial was satisfactory; while in some instances there was some repetition of the general debate, the work of delegations was facilitated, particularly with respect to the preparation of draft resolutions.

Members will recall that the Committee devoted two meetings to the question of the rationalization of the work of the Committee and to consideration of a first draft resolution prepared by the members of the Bureau. Considerable informal consultations ensued with the participation of delegations most interested in the issue; these were open to all interested delegations.

The result of this endeavour was the submission of a draft resolution, to which many delegations made significant contributions that have been taken up by the sponsors. The final version appears in document A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1, which I am now introducing.

As delegations will appreciate, the draft is based on the Committee's experience of previous years as well as on the results of the first trial, to which I referred earlier. The five phases established in operative paragraph 1 are the ones that have been clearly set out now in our work.

Operative paragraph 2 is also based on the Committee's experience in the course of its present session. I wish particularly to stress that the key point is that the draft is provisional; it is designed to reflect the real state of affairs in the Committee. There is no resolution on any item, however solemn it may appear, that is set in stone for all time. In addition to this provisional nature is the flexibility that we need to apply to our work. This is underscored in various parts of the draft resolution, in particular in operative paragraphs 3 and 4, which are based on operative paragraph 3 of resolution 48/87.

The delegations of Austria, Japan, South Africa and Ecuador are convinced that once this draft, which is self-explanatory, is adopted by the General Assembly it will make a positive contribution to the work of the Committee at its fiftieth session. We therefore trust that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Tanaka (Japan): I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons".

As a result of intensive consultations with interested delegations, we believe that the revised text provides grounds for broader support, and we appeal to all delegations to consider it favourably.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I wish to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

The United States supports in principle the convening of a fourth special session on disarmament. We believe that the appropriate consultations should take place in order to prepare for a productive special session. In this regard, we note the deliberate and multi-year procedure pursued to prepare for past special sessions, procedures which were supported by consensus. With this consideration in mind, the United States is proposing an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.34/Rev.1. Since it will take some time for the Secretariat to produce the amendment in writing, I will describe it orally.

The amendment would first delete "central" in the fourth preambular paragraph. Then it would replace the current wording of operative paragraph 1 to read as follows:

> "Decides in principle to convene a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament at an appropriate date, to be determined following consultations".

Our amendment would then proceed to delete operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

The amendment is being submitted to the Secretariat this morning. It is co-sponsored by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom and, of course, the United States. We understand that the Secretariat will assign document number A/C.1/49/L.52 to this amendment.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their position on draft resolutions.

Mr. Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation wishes to make a few comments on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

Saudi Arabia is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution, since nuclear proliferation in our region represents a major danger — a frightful spectre that hangs over the lives of the region's peoples and poses a threat to international peace and security. I have asked to speak in order to reaffirm that the positive developments and the peace process in the Middle East — in which my country is a full participant — have not been accompanied, despite what many of us would have imagined, by any tangible steps towards nuclear disarmament in the Middle East, owing to Israel's continuing refusal to deal with this issue in a practical, objective and pragmatic manner within the framework of the peace process in the Middle East.

That is a posture that not only contradicts the peaceful climate that has been engendered in the region, but also poses a major obstacle to the achievement of a comprehensive, just and durable solution to the region's problem. It cannot be imagined that a comprehensive, just and lasting peace could be established in the region with the existing imbalances in regional security and the monopoly by one country of so many major military advantages.

It is only natural, in view of the existing dichotomy between the peace process and the issue of nuclear disarmament in the Middle East region, that the matter should be brought to this Committee. It is only normal, therefore, to appeal to Israel, as the only country in the Middle East that possesses advanced nuclear capabilities without any international guarantees, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place all its nuclear facilities under the safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

This important and fundamental measure is an absolute necessity for confidence-building and for ensuring the security of the region.

Ms. Zachariah (Malaysia): I should like to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36, entitled "Request for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

Malaysia would welcome an advisory opinion on the legal status of the use of nuclear weapons, as it desires world order and legal clarity on the question of the use of nuclear weapons.

Although the rule of international law and knowledge of the law may appear unimportant to the nuclear Powers, it is indispensable to the community of smaller nations, which feel insecure and vulnerable in a world in which stated threats of nuclear annihilation are apparently allowed to exist in a legal no-man's land.

The Government of Malaysia believes that no human catastrophe in the history of mankind can be compared to the consequences of a nuclear war. An understanding of the catastrophic levels of destruction, death and irremediable suffering as a result of an explosion of a single nuclear warhead near a populated area compels only one conclusion: no such explosion must ever happen, whether by accident, through a terrorist act or in war.

Although the end of the cold war has considerably reduced the chances of a global nuclear war, the nuclear-weapon States still subscribe to the strategy of nuclear deterrence. In the present post-cold-war climate, the legal opinion of the International Court of Justice could make an important contribution to the realization of a nuclear-weapons-free world. It could not replace nuclear disarmament initiatives, but it could provide the legal and moral parameters within which such initiatives could succeed.

Mr. Sy (Senegal) *(interpretation from French):* My delegation proposes that the Committee postpone consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36, on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons in order to enable delegations to continue their consultations.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) *(interpretation from Arabic):* The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 does not meet even the minimum of the concerns of the countries of the region regarding such a serious problem as Israeli nuclear armament.

Reference to the previous United Nations resolutions on the subject has been deleted from the draft. The draft resolution, in equating Israel's position with that of the other countries in the region which have not yet acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), ignores the fact that those countries do not have any nuclear installations, whereas Israel has at least 200 nuclear warheads, according to the most modest of estimates, the latest of which was published by Jane's *Intelligence Review* in its last issue.

The draft resolution makes no reference at all to Security Council resolution 487 (1981), in which the Council called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency, nor does it mention paragraph 14 of Security Council resolution 687 (1991), wherein the Council considered the steps taken by Iraq in the area of arms limitation as important steps towards making the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The draft also substituted for the original title of the item a new title which does not reflect the specificity of the Israeli nuclear threat to the States of the region.

Finally, my delegation wishes to express its reservations on a reference in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which prejudges negotiations that are now under way in the region.

None of last year's developments indicated any intention on the part of Israel to reconsider its position regarding the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The international community should deal with the dangers of nuclear proliferation with one single standard that does not distinguish between extreme East Asia and extreme West Asia.

Mr. Larrain (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I support the proposal by the representative of Senegal that discussion of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36 be deferred so as to give time for further consultation.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): It had been Israel's hope and expectation that the outstanding developments in the peace process in the Middle East would leave a positive mark on the Committee's deliberations and resolutions at the current session. We had hoped that this year the obsolete draft resolution under agenda item 65, "Israeli nuclear armament", would not be submitted. To our dismay, and to the dismay of other peacemakers, this did not happen.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", takes us back, both in caption and content, to the old norms, which do not befit either the spirit or the actual new political reality evolving in our region.

I also wish to make some observations in reference to the presentation made in connection with this draft resolution. It is well known that the draft resolution was conceived years ago and was retained over the years for political purposes. It had no other purpose, since its substance appears in the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, including the call to join the non-proliferation Treaty. It still has but one purpose: to perpetuate, directly or indirectly, the arraignment of Israel in this Committee.

An attempt was made to convince the Committee that the draft resolution did not single out Israel. That argument will not stand up to simple scrutiny, and there is no doubt that the State of Israel is once again being blatantly singled out for censure. The singling out of Israel is ill conceived and certainly not conducive to the building of confidence, to which the sponsors are ostensibly committed.

It will be recalled that Israel is still faced with tremendous security problems. A number of States still deny its legitimacy, and do not agree to negotiate peace. Therefore, the right equation for security and peace is not "total equality", which cannot be reached, because of the structural asymmetries of Middle East realities; security and peace are to be arrived at through, first, political accommodation and reconciliation and, secondly, equal margins of security.

Israel will continue its endeavours to attain full and comprehensive peace with all its neighbours. At the same time, Israel will continue to advocate direct negotiations, as they are being conducted now, as the only way to deal with arms control in the region. That includes the nuclear issue, which will be dealt with in due course in the appropriate forum within the multilateral talks.

As the Secretary-General has underlined, the nuclear issue should be dealt with, not in a political vacuum, but in the context of peace, once outstanding problems have been solved. Hence, the primacy of peace must be given due acknowledgement. The peace process in all its facets deserves the support and encouragement of the international community, especially at this moment.

At its forty-eighth session the General Assembly reacted to the new reality of the Middle East by beginning to change obsolete resolutions. This item should not have been on the agenda at all, and its inclusion again this year in a "moderate version" takes us back to the days when the Arab-Israeli conflict dominated the region of the Middle East. Hence, we strongly urge the members of the Committee to cast a negative vote on this draft resolution, which will naturally constitute a vote in favour of the ongoing peace process.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of the Russian Federation, the United States and the United Kingdom, co-depositaries of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to explain why we shall be voting against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.28, entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

We shall do so because the question of background documentation for a conference of States parties to a treaty, like the question of legal interpretations of particular provisions of that treaty, is a matter solely for the States parties to the treaty, not the United Nations General Assembly. It is therefore inappropriate for this Committee to adopt a resolution calling upon States parties to the NPT to provide their legal interpretations of article X, paragraph 2, of the NPT and their views on the different options and actions available, for compilation by the Secretary-General as a background document for the 1995 Review Conference on the NPT.

The proper forum in which to address these issues is the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Conference. The question of background documentation for that Conference has already been under active consideration at the earlier meetings of the Preparatory Committee, and it is due to be discussed again at the fourth meeting, to be held here in New York in January. Indeed, at the third meeting of the Preparatory Committee, over which Nigeria presided and where Nigeria proposed background documentation on article X, paragraph 2, this issue was deferred by consensus to the fourth meeting. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.28 is an inappropriate attempt to bypass the preparatory process for the 1995 Conference.

For these reasons we advised the sponsors of this draft resolution not to submit it in this forum. When they did so, we proposed a number of amendments which would have made it clear that it was for the NPT States parties themselves to take decisions about the background documentation for their Conference. The amendments would also have brought greater balance to the preambular section of the draft resolution in terms of the objectives of the Treaty and would have removed the potential ambiguity in the present drafting of the sixth preambular paragraph by making it clear that the only options available for the extension decision are those provided for in article X, paragraph 2, of the Treaty.

We very much regret that the sponsors declined to accept any of these proposed amendments. We therefore see no option but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 in its entirety. We urge other States parties to the NPT to vote against it as well.

Mr. Amar (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Morocco fully supports the proposal by the representative of Senegal that action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36, "Request for an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons", be deferred so that broader consultation will be possible.

Mr. Whannou (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): We join the delegation of Morocco in supporting the proposal that the Committee defer its decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36, by which the General Assembly would request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. In our view, it would be inappropriate to ask the Court for an advisory opinion on such an abstract, hypothetical and essentially political matter. Further, a legal opinion would have no practical effect.

Successes achieved over the years in limiting and banning weapons have resulted from the negotiation of treaties. The draft resolution would not contribute to further arms agreements on nuclear weapons.

The spokesman for the sponsors recognized this fact last year in a statement in the First Committee, in which he welcomed

> "the broadening and deepening of the dimensions of disarmament"

and explained that the Non-Aligned Movement would not press for a vote

> "in order to preserve the momentum and progress generated by these initiatives".

Given this view, it is even harder to fathom the purpose of a draft resolution requesting such an opinion from the International Court of Justice this year, when further steps to control and eliminate nuclear weapons are being taken, negotiated or contemplated.

The United States therefore urges States to abstain or vote "No" on this draft resolution. It prefers to see energy and attention devoted instead to achieving concrete results in the area of arms control and disarmament.

The Chairman: Some delegations have requested the postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): I should like to make two statements — one on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 and one on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

I shall start with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28. On behalf of the European Union and the applicant countries, I wish to explain why we shall be voting against this draft resolution, which is entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". In the draft resolution States parties are invited to provide their legal interpretations of article X, paragraph 2, of the Treaty for compilation by the Secretary-General as a background document for the 1995 Conference.

It is not appropriate for the General Assembly to adopt such a resolution, as the question of background documentation for the Conference of States parties is a matter solely for those States, as is the question of the legal interpretation of certain provisions of the Treaty.

We believe that the proper place in which to address these issues is the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Conference, rather than the First Committee. We regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 decided to submit their draft in this forum despite the fact that it had been agreed by consensus at the third meeting of the Preparatory Committee that this matter would be pursued at the forthcoming meeting of that body.

I should like now to make a statement before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21. Traditionally, draft resolutions dealing with the implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures have been adopted without a vote.

The purpose of previous draft resolutions on this subject has always been to welcome the implementation of confidence-building measures effected at any level and to encourage Member States to continue such action whenever appropriate.

We much regret that this year, for the first time ever, a vote on this topic has been requested. This is regrettable, particularly since the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 feel that the goal of this year's draft resolution is not different from that of previous years. The only difference is to be found in some language that takes into account the fact that in different regions, such as Africa, Asia and Europe, activities are taking place to prevent conflicts and to settle conflicts peacefully in order to contribute to peace-making and peace-building.

In this draft resolution all those involved in such activities — individual Member States, regions and the international community as a whole — are encouraged to take advantage of confidence-building measures, as political means, whenever appropriate. This is the purpose of the draft resolution, which was certainly not intended to prejudge, with any wording, ongoing activities in other forums.

Mr. Fasehun (Nigeria): The position of the Nigerian delegation and of other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 is informed by our desire to improve the preparatory process in respect of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

The United Nations Secretariat became involved in the preparatory process through a resolution whose draft was approved by the First Committee about two years ago. We saw the draft resolution then as a mandate for the Secretariat to service the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference.

What we propose is no more than a request to the various Member States that are parties to the NPT to submit to the Secretariat their legal interpretations of article X, paragraph 2, for compilation by the Secretary-General. We believe that such interpretations are important to correct what we see as the prevailing tendentious interpretation.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I wish to inquire whether, within the terms of rule 128, it is appropriate for a member putting forward a proposal to explain his vote on his own proposal. My understanding was that we had reached the stage of explaining our votes and were not making statements before the voting or introducing draft resolutions. My belief is that the statement we have just heard was out of order and should be struck from the record.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Mr. Chairman, you no doubt permitted the representative of Nigeria to make his statement in the light of the precedent set by the representative of Germany with his reference to his own draft resolution (A/C.1/49/L.21).

Mr. Gajda (Hungary): Very briefly, on behalf of Hungary, an associate member of the European Union, I should like to associate my delegation fully with the statement by the representative of Germany concerning the position of members of the European Union and applicant States regarding draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions to which I have referred: draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, L.28, L.31, L.21, L.7/Rev.1 and L.49/Rev.1. I would recall that action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36 has been postponed.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish):* At the start of the meeting this morning, Mr. Chairman, you indicated that we would take action on a number of draft resolutions. In the course of our discussions this morning some delegations suggested postponing action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36. Does this mean that action is being postponed until this afternoon's meeting? Will it be put off until tomorrow? What is meant by "postponement"?

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* A number of delegations proposed the postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36. It would be my hope that this draft resolution could be voted upon during this afternoon's meeting, if we have an afternoon meeting, or at tomorrow morning's meeting. Of course, I hope that the delegations concerned will be kind enough to indicate whether draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36 will be ready to be voted on and that it is not necessary to continue the consultations to which delegations have referred.

Is this explanation satisfactory to the representative of Mexico?

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish):* It is satisfactory, Sir. The only thing I do not know is where these consultations are taking place.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* It is my understanding that interested delegations will know where the consultations are taking place.

Mr. Wiranataatmadja (Indonesia): I fully share your interpretation of this postponement issue, Mr. Chairman: we are going to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.36 at a later stage.

Mr. Larrain (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish):* On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament", under agenda item 64 (b), I wish to propose, first, the deletion of the last preambular paragraph, the tenth.

Secondly, I propose the insertion of the following new operative paragraph 1:

> "1. *Recognizes* the legitimate aspirations of the candidate countries to participate fully in the work of the Conference on Disarmament".

As a result, the current operative paragraphs 1 and 2 should be renumbered 2 and 3 respectively.

Finally, I propose the insertion, at the end of the new operative paragraph 2, of the following:

> ", as well as the report of the Conference on Disarmament on its 1994 session;".

The new operative paragraph 2 would then read:

> "2. *Recalls* the report of 12 August 1993 of the Special Coordinator for membership designated by the Conference on Disarmament and the subsequent statement made by the Special Coordinator on 23 August 1993, recommending a dynamic solution to the question of membership, as well as the report of the Conference on Disarmament on its 1994 session".

The sponsors of the draft resolution trust that, with the amendments just indicated, it will be possible for the Committee to adopt it without a vote.

Mrs. Londoño Jaramillo (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, on implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures.

The implementation of confidence-building measures in relations with other States has been of constant concern to Colombia because we see it as a mechanism for creating favourable conditions for the peaceful settlement of conflicts. A climate of confidence is established on the basis of adherence to and respect for international law. This is reflected in document A/49/210 of 1 July 1994.

We support the sovereign efforts of every country and area to promote peace in their respective regions. However, a number of aspects of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 fail to take account of the fragile and precarious balance that was struck in the negotiations on resolutions 47/120 A and 47/120 B. In this respect, it is important to bear in mind the evolving nature of recent achievements and the acknowledgment that confidence-building measures in their various forms need to be seen in the context of certain guiding principles, such as sovereign equality, the political independence and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in their internal affairs.

We would have preferred not to have the seventh preambular paragraph link prevention with the peaceful settlement of conflicts. Although the United Nations Charter embodies some of these ideas, others are more recent and remain the subject of discussion in other General Assembly bodies.

The tenth preambular paragraph, similarly, gives equal weight to different criteria and is not in accord with the resolutions referred to earlier.

Furthermore, operative paragraph 5 fails to reflect the evolution of the new concepts and the fact that each situation in which it is possible to implement peace-building measures is different from all others. It also introduces elements that require the participation of third parties, without giving proper weight to the specific nature of each situation.

Colombia will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation also wishes to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures".

My delegation has carefully and attentively analysed the draft resolution sponsored by Germany and other countries on this question. In the past the Cuban delegation participated in discussions that led to the successful adoption of the guidelines on confidence-building measures and it joined the consensus in that regard. Similarly, in the framework of the General Assembly and the First Committee, it participated in the discussions, and supported draft resolutions, on the question of confidence building and the implementation of measures to that end.

It is our delegation's view, as reflected in respective documents on confidence-building measures, that, *inter alia*, confidence-building measures vary. They can be of a political, military, economic or other nature. But, while keeping in mind certain principles in their implementation, my delegation values some in particular, such as the desire of States to participate in such measures and unwavering respect for the sovereignty of States. In this case, there must also be consent on the part of the State concerned.

Despite the efforts that have been made — and my delegation acknowledges the full readiness of the German delegation, on behalf of the sponsors, to cooperate — my delegation regrets that it has not been possible to arrive at a solution that would take into account the points of view of various delegations, including my own, concerning the seventh preambular paragraph, in which the General Assembly would welcome the establishment of regional mechanisms, institutions or forums entrusted with the prevention and peaceful settlement of conflicts. In other words, this applies to concepts of preventive diplomacy.

The Cuban delegation recognizes the existence of such mechanisms in certain regions, and we are familiar in particular with the experience of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. We know that the countries of that region have taken such decisions of their free will, and we wish them every success in their endeavours. However, as formulated in the draft resolution under consideration, the United Nations would be extending an invitation to that kind of mechanism or forum, and my delegation believes that this position should arise from the sovereign free expression of the will of the countries of each region and should not be implemented at the invitation of the world Organization.

My delegation also has certain difficulties with this draft resolution in relation to the eleventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, in which confidence-building measures are linked to new and evolving concepts such as peace-keeping, peace-building and others. As everyone knows, negotiations are currently under way in the Fourth Committee on this question and have yet to be concluded. Furthermore, discussions on this matter have taken place on the initiative of certain countries in the plenary. My delegation would have preferred not to see these elements included here, but unfortunately we could reach no accommodation. That is why my delegation will also abstain in the voting on this draft resolution when it is put to the vote.

Mr. Chandra (India): My delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures".

We attach great importance to confidence-building measures and would have very much liked to be able to support the draft resolution on this issue. We have, unfortunately, been deprived of the opportunity to do so, as our suggestions for making the draft resolution more meaningful were not taken on board.

In our view, a major shortcoming in this draft resolution, in operative paragraph 2, is its failure to acknowledge that confidence-building measures should be on the basis of initiatives and with the agreement and cooperation of the States of the region concerned. This was done in resolution 47/54 D, which was adopted by consensus, but it has not been done in this draft resolution.

My delegation also fully subscribes to the views expressed by the representatives of Cuba and Colombia, in particular with regard to operative paragraph 5, which brings in the concept of external involvement in regional problems and issues, which is not acceptable to us. Accordingly, we will be constrained to abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote before the Committee takes action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures". We attach great importance to this question. We have always subscribed to similar draft resolutions at previous sessions. Unfortunately, we shall not be in a position to support this draft resolution this year. My delegation will therefore abstain. We take the view that it is not appropriate to present the draft resolution in its present version. Similarly, we believe that the conceptual approach adopted this year by the sponsors in the preparation of this draft resolution does not respond at this point to the concerns expressed by many delegations in the debates on this issue. We would therefore have liked to see more in-depth consultations on this draft resolution so that everyone could assess the progress made in the United Nations work on this important issue. We would have liked the sponsors to be aware of the unresolved problems in order to make the concepts that are being put forward in this draft resolution acceptable.

As we see it, this draft resolution tends to prejudge the result of the work now going on and goes beyond the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on this question, including resolution 47/720 B. In our view, it would have been better to await the outcome of the work of other bodies addressing this issue before taking any such initiative within this Committee, including concepts that are still being elaborated. As a result of the failure to take account of the various concerns, my delegation will unfortunately not be in a position this year to lend its support to the draft resolution.

Mr. Eltinay (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation fully supports any initiative aimed at introducing confidence-building measures in all regions, particularly in our region, since it is among those suffering from conflict. Sudan has taken a number of initiatives and done its utmost to strengthen confidence, particularly with respect to the domestic problems caused by the conflict imposed on my country for 40 years now. A Committee made up of a number of African Heads of State has been striving to solve these problems. Despite all the efforts Sudan has made, despite the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, and despite our attempt to ensure the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote, as happened last year, my delegation has difficulty in supporting the draft resolution, since certain elements in operative paragraph 5 open the door to third parties' intervening in regional questions. Therefore, my delegation, consistent with this position, will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Mauritania and Djibouti.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Argentina, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian

Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.l/49/L.11/Rev.l was adopted by 55 votes to 5, with 82 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28, entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 14th meeting of the Committee on 7 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28, I should like to read into the record the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

> "By draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 the General Assembly would invite States parties to provide the legal interpretations of article X, paragraph 2, and their views on the different options and actions available for compilation by the Secretary-General as a background document of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) well before the holding of that Conference. It should be noted that the 1995 NPT Conference is a Conference of the States Parties to that Treaty. As was the case with previous such conferences, the draft rules of procedure of the Conference presently under consideration by the States Parties include arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference. Under those arrangements, no additional cost is borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to compile a background document has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the 1995 Conference. Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties, and under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations. They may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States Parties in advance."

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Guyana, India, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, San Marino, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.28 was adopted by 77 votes to 39, with 32 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 14th meeting on 7 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Sudan and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Estonia, Fiji, Georgia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Sweden, Tajikistan, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31 was adopted by 98 votes to 23, with 31 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Costa

Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Surinme, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, as orally amended this morning by the representative of Chile.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, as orally amended by Chile, was introduced by the representative of Chile at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 9 November 1994, and was sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, Iraq, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, Israel and Sierra Leone.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee", was introduced by the Chairman of the First Committee at the Committee's 22nd meeting, on 17 November 1994, and was sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Ecuador, Japan and South Africa. In connection with this draft resolution, I should like to read into the record the following statement on behalf of the Secretariat:

> "Under the terms of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1, the General Assembly would *inter alia* urge the Secretary-General from within existing resources to allocate appropriate support and a high proportion of available conference space to the First Committee for its fiftieth session to enable it adequately to implement its work programme. In this connection, it should be noted that there are five large and two small conference rooms with the required space for formal and informal meetings of the six Main Committees. As in the past, the Secretariat would endeavour to allocate the existing space and resources to all the Main Committees on a shared basis."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: We have completed taking action on those draft resolutions that were scheduled for this morning.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.